The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1893.

The Week.

THE natural or business order on the occurrence of any serious crisis in public affairs is undoubtedly to call the national Legislature together to consider and meet the emergency. As we have frequently pointed out, were the machinery of government what it ought to be, the new Congress would meet as soon after the election as mechanical arrangements would permit, to execute the trust prescribed by its constituents. President Cleveland is, we have no doubt, as sensible of this as anybody, and yet he has decided not to convene Congress now, or before September, but to deal with the currency crisis with the powers the law has already placed in his hands, and to postpone Congressional action on the tariff till the autumn. Why is this? Simply, we believe—though we have no positive information on the subject—because he perceives, as do most other observers, that if Congress got together now, it would not devote itself at once to the consideration of the tariff, or any other public question, but to the work of helping him to fill the public offices. Were Congress in session to-day, the probabilities are that Washington would be crowded with office-seeking constituents, and the principal business of the members would be accompanying them to the White House and the departments for the presentation of "claims" and testimonials. Neither the President nor any member of the Cabinet would have a moment left from morning till night for the discharge of a single one of his imperative duties. The appointments which the President has to make he would not be allowed to make with deliberation, knowledge, or care. Removals and appointments which he need not make at all, or need not make now, would be pressed upon him vociferously, and the golden moments intended by the Constitution for the grave work of gathering up the reins of government would be spent in listening to harangues on the services of Jerry This and Jo That during the late memorable campaign. Moreover, the prospect of securing any legislation would be very small, so widespread would be the determination not to give votes to Administration measures except in return for consulships, and postoffices, and collectorships, and appraiserships.

These difficulties, it is true, are likely to appear in their gravest form only when the election has made a transfer of power to a new party. They would not occur, or would occur only in a much milder form, if, for instance, Gen. Harrison had been reëlected with a Congressional majority of his own party. But there is no juncture at which the country has more imperative need of the best services of a new Congress than that created by the expulsion of the old party from office, because this expulsion means a popular demand for a new policy. Could there be a better illustration of the evils of the spoils system—that is, of the treatment of the public offices as desirable booty—than the fact that it makes the Legislature at such a moment as this an embarrassment, and not a help, to the Executive?

In withdrawing the Hawaiian treaty from the Senate, President Cleveland has simply taken the straightforward way of undoing what never should have been done. Whatever steps he may contemplate in the future, this decided action of his can mean only that he has fundamental objections to the treaty, either on account of the manner of its negotiation or on account of its terms, or both. To suppose that he recalled it because of minor defects alone is absurd; these could easily have been remedied by amendments in the Senate. To imagine that he is jealous of the glory that would accrue to his predecessor by its ratification, and that he will soon send in another treaty to be identified with his own name, is worthy of the small minds which have adopted this fancy. With them it is simply a survival of the old ignoble contest between Blaine and Harrison as to which one should wear the laurels of reciprocity, and they have not yet got used to the change of atmosphere at Washington. The President gives the country to understand that there is going to be no offhand decision of the grave question, and that time will be taken and the proper means employed to find out the real sentiments of the Hawaiians themselves, and to probe the mercenary schemes that have been masquerading in the guise of patriotism. In all this he has faithfully reflected the views and wishes of the great majority of the people of this country.

Mr. Thurston of the Hawaiian Annexation Committee made an address before a Washington club last week, and was asked if it was true that the Sugar Trust would come in, under the contract with Hawaiian planters, for half of any bounty that might hereafter be paid them. His reply was a complete confirmation of our own report to that effect. He said:

"When Claus Spreckels and the Sugar Trust consolidated their interests, the representatives of the latter said to the sugar-planters of Hawaii: 'We are ready now to take your sugar for a term of five years, upon certain conditions.' One of these conditions was that if at any time the Hawaiian planters should receive the benefits of sugar bounty provided by the McKinley Law, the Trust was to have half of the amount paid on Hawaiian sugar. 'If you don't like these terms, eat your sugar,' the Trust said to the planters."

Mr. Thurston said that the planters protested, and went so far as to set up a refining plant of their own in San Francisco. But they found they could not sell a pound of sugar, so completely had the Trust got all the San Francisco grocers in its power. Then they gave it up and "the contract was signed last summer." Mr. Thurston said that he himself was one of the victims, and another Commissioner, who was present, Mr. Castle, said that he was also. This frank revelation comes in time to prevent the United States from becoming a third victim.

In some respects it is a good thing that we have no cable communication with Hawaii, as the belated news now coming in would all have been headed off if it had been known in the Islands, three weeks ago, as it was in this country, that the treaty of annexation would not be ratified. But as it was, everything was going swimmingly on the assurances of Commissioner Thurston that his mission would be a great success, and the performances now reported show to what a huge business scheme the United States were asked to lend themselves. The more excitable and less affluent part of the American element "blossomed out with handkerchiefs and head-coverings made of the stars and stripes," but the majority had a truer eye for the great political issues involved, and at once began "to cast about for bargains." Towns were promptly "plotted and laid out in the usual boom fashion," and there was a general opinion that the crown lands, if got hold of by hook or by crook, would make an ideal "ground plan of a colossal real-estate deal." Furthermore, the question was naturally "raised" whether the United States would not take Samoa too while about it. In fact, some thoughtful "native politicians" pointed out that there was already a treaty of "political confederacy" between Hawaii and Samoa, which the United States would annex along with the Islands, with all the "legal obligations" involved. We see no way of meeting this argument, and feel confident that Samoa could easily be shown to be the "key of the Pacific," which it would be simply humiliating not to have in our breeches pocket.

Congressman Dingley is one of the greatest friends of American shipping, and yet he is in favor of allowing Claus Spreckels to fly the American flag over four foreign-built steamers. At least he says he is in favor of annexing Hawaii, and San Francisco despatches affirm Spreckels's intention to buy two steamers from the Cunard Company and two from the Peninsular and Oriental Company, get a Hawaiian register for them, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then have them annexed. He now has American steamers on his Honolulu line, but these he is going to put into the coasting service, and get the foreign boats for an Australian and Hawaiian line. The heinousness of the transaction may be inferred from the statement made by an alarmed patriot, that he could buy these vessels for $1,500,000 each, while if compelled to build them in this country, as he ought to be, they would cost $2,000,000 each, and would clothe and feed a vast number of American workingmen. It is charitable to suppose that Mr. Dingley did not know of this scheme, and it is also safe to say that it will induce a strong opposition to annexation among all patriotic ship-builders. Annexation received a fearful wound in the house of its supposed friends when the Union League Club voted against it, and now if it is going to let in English-built ships without giving the Cramps an order for as many more, it is clear that the plan was by no means so "American" as it was cracked up to be.

It appears that the Solicitor-General at Washington wrote an opinion before the expiration of President Harrison's term of office to the effect that, while undoubtedly the law of 1875 authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds for the purpose of replenishing the Treasury's supply of coin, either gold or silver, there was nothing on the statute-book authorizing the issue of bonds for gold alone. In other words, the bonds, if issued, are to be payable in coin, not merely in gold coin, and accordingly payment for them may be made by the purchasers in coin, either silver or gold. This opinion, if any such has been prepared, is sound, but can hardly be considered important, since nobody has proposed to issue bonds payable in gold alone. It is not likely that any subscriber for the bonds would take pains to collect silver dollars throughout the country to pay for them, since he would be obliged to pay 100 cents for each one, besides the cost of collecting them. Nor, for the same reason, would he collect silver certificates. Any purchaser would draw his check on his bank, and this check would pass through the Clearing-house in the usual way, resulting in a balance in favor of the Government. As all funds, up to this time, are equivalent to gold, the result would be the same thing to the Government as a gold balance. The Solicitor General's law may be, and we think is, right, but it is accompanied by a wrong economical conception, if he is correctly reported as saying that the act of 1878 "restored silver to its old monetary place." It did nothing of the kind. Its old monetary place was free coinage; that is, a privilege extended to any holder of silver in any part of the world to bring it to the United States Mint to be converted into legal-tender money—in other words, the same privilege that exists as regards gold. Any holder of this metal, whether a citizen of the United States, or of India, or of Japan, can bring it to our mints and have it coined into eagles as a matter of right, and these coins will become legal tender throughout the United States. Now, nothing short of this can be called "restoring silver to its old monetary place." Solicitor-General Aldrich's legal distinction is, for the present at least, a distinction without a difference.

Of all the curious ideas that have been advanced about the Treasury gold reserve of $100,000,000, the *Tribune's* grave comparison of it to a banking reserve, which ought to be paid out without hesitation in times of financial panic, is about the most awry that we have seen. It cites what Bagehot says of the banking reserve held in the Bank of England, and says his opinions "describe accurately the proper function of the ultimate reserve in this country, which is held by the Treasury." But what possible analogy can there be between the banking department of the Bank of England and the Treasury, which does no banking at all, or between the variable reserve of the former, held for one purpose, and the fixed reserve of the latter, held for quite another purpose? Yet the *Tribune* urges this analogy as a part of that "common sense" of which "bank presidents stand greatly in need." We presume they will be content to leave to editors a monopoly of such uncommon nonsense.

The failure of the Senate Finance Committee to act on the House bill repealing the duty on pig-tin makes it quite probable that that metal will be taxed four cents per pound on and after the 1st of July next. It must not be supposed, however, that the Government will derive any considerable sum, in the way of revenue, from this tax. There is a strong pecuniary inducement to import tin before the 1st of July in order to save the four cents per pound. It is probable that a sufficient amount will be brought in before that date to supply the demand till the new Congress repeals the tax. This prospective demand has already had its effect on the London market, where the price of tin has advanced £1 per ton. It appears that London had the correct news from Washington as to the Tin Bill before New York had it. It is feared that the failure of the bill will have a discouraging effect on our tin-dipperies, whose infancy has been watched over with such solicitude by Special Treasury Agent Ayer.

The bill for regulating the printing and distribution of public documents was unfortunately lost in the hurly-burly of the last hours of Congress. It passed the Senate during the first session, and in the second session passed the House with some important amendments. These were sent to conference, from which neither they nor the bill ever emerged. This is much to be regretted, as the bill would undoubtedly have been effective in bringing something like unity and business principles into a department notorious for its unsystematic and extravagant methods. The experienced Superintendent of Documents, Mr. J. G. Ames, made a report in advocacy of the proposed law, in which he convincingly showed its advantages, not the least of them being an annual saving of $300,000 or more in the public-documents account, without failing to meet a single legitimate demand. That such a law, acceptable in all its general provisions to a majority of both houses of Congress, and urgently needed for the good of the public service, should have been allowed to fail on account of minor differences, shows a surprising lack of intelligence or energy on the part of those responsible.

The decision of the Supreme Court in the letter-carriers' case is, that when the law makes eight hours a day's work, it means it, and that it cannot be got around in the way attempted by the Post-office Department. This will result either in a crippling of the service or in an increased appropriation, but it is best that the taxpayers should have the consequences of labor legislation put in a clear light. Then they can make up their minds whether they are willing to foot the bills for paying Government employees higher wages than are given in private businesses for equivalent work. It has been one great evil of the eight-hour movement, as applied to Government employees, that the plain intent of the law has been so often evaded by the heads of departments. The act of 1868, making eight hours a day's work "for all laborers, workmen, and mechanics" employed by the Government, was successfully evaded for a time by giving full wages only to those who would work for ten hours. This led to such an agitation as to call forth a proclamation from the President in 1869, and from that year up to 1877 full pay was given for eight hours' work in all the navy-yards and naval stations of the United States. In 1877, however, the Secretary of the Navy returned to the ten-hours system, compelling those who elected to work but eight hours to accept a proportionate reduction in wages. This plan was finally modified so as to make the ten-hours system apply only from March to September. But the men have claimed extra pay for those months, and the Committee on Labor reported in 1890 that the Government could not escape from the responsibility of payment. The whole history has been one of shifts and evasions, and it is high time that the laws were enforced to the letter. That would show their unfairness and lead to their repeal.

The action of the general managers of all the railways entering Chicago, in regard to strikes which are threatening either now or in the future, is a signifi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cant departure. The managers came together to consider demands for higher wages which had been presented by the Switchmen's Mutual Aid Association. They voted unanimously to refuse the demands, declaring that the rates paid at present were uniform, were the highest ever paid in Chicago for similar service, and were higher than those paid in many other localities. This declaration was made unanimously, and was followed by an agreement, also unanimous, to discharge all union men on all the lines in case the roads should be crippled by a strike of switchmen. This would apply to engineers, conductors, firemen, and to all branches of organized railroad labor. The managers declared that they would not pay union men for doing nothing when their idleness was enforced by strikers to whom they were giving aid and encouragement. In case they are forced to discharge all their union men, they will fill the vacancies as rapidly as possible with non-union men, and distribute them according to the needs of the several roads.

It is interesting to observe how speedily the grievances of the switchmen melted away before this resolute and united action. All the machinery was ready for a strike of large dimensions, and the Grand Masters and Grievance Committees were beginning to emit the usual threats about boycotting and tying up right and left. But when they found the roads not only ready for them, but proposing to make the fight even sharper and more relentless than they had dared even to threaten to make it, they suddenly discovered that they had no injuries that could not wait indefinitely to be redressed. As long as they could not deny the main fact in the company's statement, namely, that their wages were as high as those paid anywhere in the country for similar work, they had no chance for securing public sympathy. The apparent stringency and unusual unanimity of the managers' action were undoubtedly prompted by the approach of the opening of the World's Fair, and the extensive preparation which labor agitators have been making for a long time to turn the heavy traffic of the summer to special account for themselves. Mr. Powderly "gave it away" in his letters to the organizer of the New York Central Railway strike in the spring of 1890, when he intimated broadly that the political influences of a Presidential contest would prevent resistance to strikes in 1892, and that the necessity of keeping the railways running to the Fair would act in the same way in 1893. The railway managers appear to have had warnings of what is coming and to have determined to "nip the thing in the bud." Their action is an absolute necessity if they are to keep their roads running during the Fair, for if labor agitators once got the upper hand of them, there would be no limit to the "demands" which would follow, one after another, until the management of the roads would be practically in Labor's hands.

The queer Kansas Legislature has passed a bill making all contracts payable in legal-tender money, and defining legal tender as gold coin, or silver coin, or United States notes, or Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890. The bill also forbids the making of contracts payable in gold alone. As the Constitution of the United States forbids any State to make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts, the portion of the bill which declares a certain form of paper to be legal tender is simply nugatory. No State can make such paper more legal tender than it is now, nor continue its legal-tender character a moment if Congress should repeal the Legal-Tender Act. Therefore the first part of the bill merely declares gold and silver coin legal tender—a rather superfluous proceeding on the part of this Legislature. The second part is equivalent to declaring that men shall not make contracts payable in a particular way. The Supreme Court has said that contracts may be made payable in gold as well as in lumber or stone or in days' work. The question whether a State Legislature could prohibit contracts for days' work altogether, or make them payable in something quite different, is an interesting one, but not likely to be practical, since money-lenders will refuse to make new loans in a State where such dishonesty prevails. We say dishonesty, because the whole course of Populist reasoning and action in Kansas has betokened rascality rather than ignorance.

The form in which the Ballot-Law amendments have been passed by the New York Assembly is unquestionably a great improvement over that in which they were reported from committee. As they stand now, they provide for a single blanket-ballot, with the names of candidates arranged in columns by parties, each column to have a party name and emblem at the top, the voter to indicate his choice either by checking the name of each candidate for whom he wishes to vote, or by checking a full party ticket at once by means of a single mark at the top near the emblem. The addition of the emblem is an important step towards the abolition of the "paster." This fact was recognized by the Tammany and other Democratic opponents, for they declared that both emblem and "paster" were unnecessary, since a voter must be abnormally stupid as well as illiterate who cannot vote intelligently with an emblem-marked ballot. While the emblem is undoubtedly an aid to straight party voting of the most ignorant and slavish kind, it does not, as the "paster" does, afford opportunities for fraud. If we must have one or the other, the emblem is incomparably preferable. Once it is incorporated in the law, the difficulty of finding excuses for retaining the "paster" will be so great that its abolition cannot be prevented.

In the House of Commons, on the 28th of February, there was a general and highly interesting debate on the subject of the Brussels Monetary Conference and on bimetallism in general. The question came up on a motion by Mr. Meysey-Thompson that the Government should take steps to encourage the reassembling of the Conference and the continuance of the efforts to arrive at a solution of the silver question. This motion was supported by Mr. Goschen and Mr. Balfour, both of whom protested, however, that their support should not be construed as favoring a change of the monetary standard of England. The principal speech in opposition to the motion was made by Mr. Gladstone, and the portion relating to the position and needs of England as affected by the gold standard shows the grasp of a master as clearly as any speech on any financial subject in Mr. Gladstone's earlier days. The speech of Mr. Goschen was very lame in comparison, because he could not tell what he wanted. He thought that some good was likely to result from another "exchange of views," especially on the weighty subject of "introducing silver more largely into the *subsidiary* element of the currency of the world." Mr. Goschen disclaimed any intention to promote bimetallism in England, but nevertheless used the phrases commonly employed by bimetallists. He spoke, for instance, of the "work" done by gold, which was formerly done by gold and silver "in partnership." Loose jargon of this sort is not becoming in the mouth of a man of Mr. Goschen's reputation. What he really meant was, that gold and silver in partnership were able by their united strength to sustain prices, and that when silver withdrew or was expelled from the partnership, gold became tired and let prices down; but not a word of evidence was advanced to show that there had been any such effective partnership, or that prices had fallen in the way and for the cause described, or that the fall of prices was a bad thing for mankind, or, if it was, that an advance of prices now would be a good thing. Still less did he show any way to bring it about. The House was not impressed by Mr. Goschen's arguments, for it voted by 229 to 148 in favor of an amendment offered by Mr. Beckett, that, "seeing the deliberations of the International Monetary Conference mainly turned on the question of bimetallism; that after protracted sittings no agreement could be arrived at by the representatives of the assembled Powers; and that any interference with the single monetary standard now by law established in this country is open to the gravest objections, this House thinks it inexpedient that the Government should take any steps to procure the reassembly of that Conference."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAWAII AGAIN.

QUITE the most striking topic in Mr. Cleveland's inaugural address was that of the Indians. This results from the fact that nobody would have remarked the absence of it. In the first place, the Indians are always with us; in the next place, everybody assumes that any President would look humanely and sympathetically upon these wards of the nation, however circumscribed his authority to enforce just treatment of them. It is true, however, that the Indian administration during Mr. Cleveland's first term of office left much to be desired, and of this he may have been or perhaps has been made conscious, and wished to give an unmistakable sign that he would pay particular attention to the rights and needs of that class of Americans called Indians.

Whatever his motive, his utterance was full of cheer for the philanthropists who have taken this class in charge, amid endless discouragement and opposition. It gives reason—as does Mr. Cleveland's personal action from the time he first became President—for believing that he is animated by none of the vulgar contempt for men not colored like himself, and that he means to treat all the races of our mixed population with the respect and justice due to their common manhood. Repulsive, we do not doubt, seems to him the obligation imposed upon him by his predecessor of executing the proscriptive Geary Act against the inoffensive Chinese inhabitants of this country, just as he must execute the McKinley Act till it is repealed. Had he felt free in his address to embrace this class also in his kindly profession of interest and good will, he would have merited a still deeper debt of gratitude from all self-respecting Americans. Without committing himself to the policy of admission, he might have expressed a natural abhorrence of our treatment of the Chinese now with us, and of the flagrant disregard of treaty rights attendant upon such treatment.

The Geary Act is, fortunately, involved in the question of Hawaiian annexation, as to which Mr. Cleveland has yet given no intimation of his attitude other than recalling the thoroughly disreputable treaty of the late Administration. He would stand upon irrefragable ground if he opposed annexation merely in accordance with our national anti-Chinese policy. He could point to our determined efforts to suppress immigration from China and to expel the present sojourners, as a sort of mandate not to acquire territory in which the Chinese form a very large percentage of the population. He might go further, and, as we pointed out the other day, object to taking over the Hawaiian Chinese on terms which (while our present legislation and hostile spirit remain unaltered) would reduce them lower in the scale of humanity than they now are, and put a stigma upon them which they do not now wear. It would not be making slaves of freemen, but it would be subjecting them to the fate of the conquered.

The truth is, that Hawaiian annexation in any other mode than upon a general and spontaneous offer from the *whole* population of the Islands, would be virtually an act of war. It was nothing else as arranged by President Harrison and Secretary Foster, for it was based upon the ex-parte statements of revolutionists who had really nothing to give except the ground covered by their guns. To grant a protectorate, even, to such a handful, would be a high-handed proceeding, and would make us "saviours of society" to a society which did not wish to be saved, or at all events had never been consulted on the subject. The Hawaiian native is, after all, a human being; he is in his own home; he has never injured us, though in times past we have wrought incalculable injury upon him, both by our vices and our virtues. On the theory on which our Government was founded he has a right to govern himself in his own way, and we are not called upon to take any part *pro* or *con* in the internal dissensions of his country. Nobody who has reflected on the condition of Hawaiian colonization has ever doubted that the time would come when the more civilized portion would be tempted, if not forced, to coerce the less civilized, and that we should witness in the Islands the state of things which brought about at the South the end of the carpet-bag régime. But in Hawaii this was the affair of the participants, and the fact of Americans having a hand in it did not impose on us the duty of annexing the Islands and crystallizing by force the rule of the minority. It was hard to see the suffrage of the freedmen made a nullity by intimidation and fraud, but the spectacle was endurable because it was certain that time would make the evils of intimidation and fraud palpable to the whites themselves, and that the ballot would gradually regain its full efficacy, while serving—even in its nominal estate—as a protection against bodily oppression. But it would have been monstrous for the Government to turn the bayonets which it withdrew from the artificial carpet-bag governments to the support of the white minority which had asserted its power to save itself from the grossest maladministration. Yet something analogous to this we must do if we accept annexation at the hands of the "Commissioners."

As a friend of the Indian, therefore, as one who does not contemn the Chinese and who does have an honest respect for solemn treaty obligations even with an "inferior" civilization, and who could not personally do a mean act to the humblest of the Hawaiian aborigines, we hope President Cleveland will study the proposal in the light of American republican principles and of the nature of peace and war. Is it consistent to incorporate another people without a plébiscite; or, having taken a plébiscite, straightway to disfranchise the majority of those who participated in it? Is it lawful to go to war for this purpose? On the general policy of extra-continental aggrandizement we should also hope that he would ponder well, and fix a salutary precedent.

ARMED EVANGELISTS.

WE pointed out last week how the naval view of the necessity of annexing the Sandwich Islands as a means of "controlling the Pacific," as set forth by Capt. Mahan, involves the creation of a navy of the largest size, fully as large, to say the least, as that of Great Britain. Moreover, as Capt. Mahan declares explicitly:

> "The annexation, even, of Hawaii would be no mere sporadic effort, irrational because disconnected from an adequate motive, but a first fruit and a token that the nation in its evolution has aroused itself to the necessity of carrying its life—that has been the happiness of those under its influence—beyond the borders that have heretofore sufficed for its activities. That the vaunted blessings of our economy are not to be forced upon the unwilling may be conceded; but the concession does not deny the right nor the wisdom of gathering in those who wish to come. Comparative religion teaches that creeds which reject missionary enterprise are foredoomed to decay. May it not be so with nations? Certainly the glorious record of England is consequent mainly upon the spirit and traceable to the time when she launched out into the deep—without formulated policy, it is true, or foreseeing the future to which her star was leading, but obeying the instinct which in the infancy of nations anticipates the more reasoned impulses of experience. Let us, too, learn from her experience."

Elsewhere he mentions the seizure of Gibraltar and the retention of Malta, Aden, Cyprus, Egypt, India as among the exploits of England which we not only should do well to imitate, but may be compelled to imitate by a certain "law" of expansion which, he intimates, governs the growth and even the existence of great nations.

That these ideas have taken possession of the naval imagination there is no doubt, and that they were carefully nurtured by the late Administration, and by the Republican party generally, after it became a tariff party pure and simple, is also certain. Hostility to foreigners, readiness for war with them, and eagerness to inflict some kind of loss and humiliation on them, as a necessary condition of our own glory, were as much a part of the Republican creed as the advantage of dearness to the poor man. But it was not until President Harrison came into power that the navy was called into the field to stimulate and encourage this policy and find occasions for its expression and practice. The extraordinary attitude which the Administration took from the very first towards the Republic of Chili when engaged in a desperate struggle with a Catilinian adventurer attempting to subvert her institutions, was bad enough, but the freedom with which our naval officers were allowed to express their dislike of the Chilians and eagerness to fight them, was worse. The participation of the fighting force in a heated diplomatic controversy was something unprecedented in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military or naval annals of a modern civilized State. The Barrundia affair was another illustration of the same "new departure." That episode was apparently intended to impress on our naval officers the desirableness and even the duty of taking the law into their own hands on foreign stations, and of treating the peace-loving traditions of their own Government as so much lumber fit only for the garret. That the navy so understood the new policy of the State Department was made abundantly manifest in the speeches, letters, and interviews in which they expressed themselves about their new rôle. In a speech at a public dinner given to a young lieutenant in New Hampshire, he told the audience, amid wild applause, almost in set terms, that American naval officers on foreign stations were not going to be bound by the books any longer, but were going to do justice as they themselves understood it. Capt. Mahan is too experienced and cultivated a man to take any such ground as this, but his exposition and illustration of the rôle which the American Navy is to play in the future of the country is far more serviceable to the expansionists and annexationists than the vaporings which Secretary Tracy encouraged and put on record during the Chilian excitement.

It is difficult to argue with any one who thinks, because our population has reached in scanty numbers the shores of the Pacific, still leaving room on the continent for three or four hundred millions more, that we are bound, on any theory of national greatness, to seek further expansion by annexing the islands of the sea and the mongrel races of the tropics. One would have little patience with this sort of thing even if we had already carried out the programme of the Constitution among the present inhabitants of our soil by "establishing justice, insuring domestic tranquillity, providing for the common defence, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity." But everybody knows how much remains to be done before this great mission can be considered anywhere near fulfilled; how many social and political problems of the gravest order remain to be solved before we can consider ourselves at all fit for the rôle of armed evangelists. The man who thinks we should be justified now in treating ourselves to a Gibraltar, Malta, Egypt, Aden, or India, and a full line of proconsuls and vast hordes of colored subjects, must have wandered very far from American ideas of the ends of government and of the moral responsibilities attaching to the possession of great strength.

We should, too, be readier to sympathize with the desire for a huge navy to go round the world getting up quarrels for us if a single incident in our history, during the past thirty years, had brought home to us the need of having any navy at all. But the truth is, that from 1865 till now we have literally been without any navy whatever which a great naval Power need take into account, and during that period have had several differences with foreign Powers—one, at least, most formidable—and all have been settled to our satisfaction. At this moment we are, and at every moment since 1865 we have been, the Power of all Powers with which every nation on earth is most anxious *not* to quarrel. From no other will France, England, Germany, Italy, and Russia, to say nothing of Spain and Holland and the like, put up with so much, either of insolence or injury. The reason is very simple. We cannot be invaded, we have no foreign possessions to lose, and our resources in population and money are so enormous, and our capacity for doing damage when once roused so great, that any enemy, or any two enemies combined, would be sure to get the worst of it. Granted that it is well to have a respectable navy for the defence of our coasts, and the patrol of our seas, and the protection of our citizens in semi-civilized countries, it will not be well, and the American people will never submit with their eyes open, to have such a navy made the nucleus of an enormous sea force, to be "played for all it is worth" at every Presidential election as a means either of glorifying a bellicose Administration or turning popular attention away from odious party legislation. Of a huge standing army we are in no danger. But a navy, whose operations could be watched from a safe distance, and could be made to fire the patriotic heart without loss or inconvenience to the patriots, and which, under the Barrundia rulings, might keep us in perpetual hot water, would be a serious menace to our institutions, even if it had no foreign dependencies to watch over, or sugar, or coffee, or tobacco bosses to protect.

HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE.

UNUSUAL attention was called to the confused scramble in which the business of the last Congress was conducted during its two or three closing days, though there was really nothing unusual about it. It has long been the fact that the last hours of Congress, and, indeed, of State Legislatures, resemble nothing in the world more nearly than a battlefield where the figures of the contestants are half-hidden, where everything is noise and shouting, and where no man can tell what the total upshot of the fierce struggling is until the smoke has cleared away and the killed and wounded and survivors are counted up. The reason that the spectacle was more in evidence this year than usual was that several important bills were pending up to the very end, and it was a long time before it was possible to find out whether they had come out of the scrimmage. For example, the bill repealing the stupid blunder of McKinley in putting a tax on pig-tin passed the House without opposition; the Republicans either kept a shamefaced silence or voted for it. It was brought up in the Senate, and was said, in some of the press reports, to have passed. Yet there was some doubt on the point, and it was really twenty-four hours or more after the adjournment of Congress before the truth could be positively ascertained. Then it was found that the bill had been lost in the hurly-burly.

No one knows who killed it or why it was killed. No reason is given why this rectification of a McKinley blunder was squelched while the other one, relating to the increased taxes on linen goods, was permitted to become a law. There was no open opposition to the bill. Very considerable business interests were involved in it, and were particularly dependent upon knowing whether it had passed. But they were left in entire uncertainty for several days, and exposed to no small pecuniary loss, simply because of the chaotic condition of the public business at the winding-up of Congress.

The surface cause of this state of things is, that the appropriation bills have the right of way, and are used as clubs to kill off all legislation which is, for any reason, obnoxious to any of the managers of Congressional business. This process was unusually conspicuous in the last Congress. It was admitted, even by the *Tribune's* Washington correspondent, that the public business was in a much more forward state three days before adjournment than it had been at a corresponding date in Speaker Reed's Congress. As far as the great appropriation bills were concerned, they could easily have been got out of the way long before the hour for adjournment arrived. But they were nursed along by unnecessary disagreements on conference reports and in other ways, and kept always in reserve to push any upstart measure off the track. The managers were visibly afraid to give Congress its head. Nothing but the tactical advantage of the delayed appropriation bills prevented a number of laws from securing enactment which could easily have mustered a majority vote.

Of course, bad bills were killed along with the good. It is only fair to reckon in the gains with the losses. If the Block-tin Bill was lost in the mêlée, and the important Public Documents Bill and the New Jersey Bridge Bill—for all of which a majority vote was ready to go on record—so, too, let us thankfully add, was the Anti-Option Bill, and we know not what other pestiferous measures. We ought to count up our mercies, and be thankful that it is as well with us as it is. Furthermore, taking the view that all laws are, in so far, a restraint on liberty, and that the vast majority of bills introduced in any Congress are either needless or positively mischievous, we may find some reason for being reconciled to a system of lawmaking which is ingeniously devised to reduce the laws made to the minimum.

Yet the fact remains that the system is a vicious one, and is tantamount to a confession that Congress cannot be trusted

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to do what a majority of the members want to do. Congress itself has recognized this fact. An amendment was made to the House rules in the last Congress, which ordered all appropriation bills to be reported by committees having them in charge within eighty days after the beginning of the long session, and within forty in the short session. This was expressly intended to expedite the public business and to do away with the blind rush at the end. Yet, in practice, the leaders of the House, as we have seen, were afraid to let the rule work as it was intended to, and armed themselves, as before, with the appropriation bills, as with so many swords, to bar the way to all other legislation. The result is but to emphasize the fact that Congressional government is simply government by a half-dozen committees.

It is easy and plausible to say that this is the best we can do, given the increasing ignorance or worse of the majority of our representatives in Legislature or Congress. If they were not bound hand and foot by rules, and clubbed into submission or helplessness by party leaders, whose life or property would be safe? There is force in this question, we admit, yet we say again the system is a vicious one. It is clear, for one thing, that it partly exaggerates the very evils it is designed to suppress. What an encouragement to reckless demagogues it is, for example, to know that it is perfectly safe to introduce in Congress, and advocate with a great flourish, scandalous bills of all sorts, inasmuch as it is certain they can never run the gauntlet of the rules and become law. It is fair to presume that a good part of the fiery zeal of the supporters of the Anti-Option Bill, in behalf of the oppressed farmers, was due to the fact that they knew they could not pass it.

But the fundamental objection to the system is, that it serves to hide from the people the true state of the case. It encourages them to go on trusting to our proverbial luck to come out all right somehow. But what is needed is to have the badness of legislators put in a clear light, not masked under rules of business which tie their hands. It is not enough to put up with representatives who cannot do the harm they would, but to get those who would not pass bad laws if they could. We believe that all such exhibitions of legislative iniquity as have been seen at Albany and Trenton this winter will ultimately have a good effect in arousing the people to a choice of better representatives. And similarly we believe that the freer the rein given to bad lawmakers, the sooner the people will be convinced of the necessity of choosing men whom they can trust, with rules or without.

BALFOUR AND CHURCHILL.

THE recent split in the Conservative ranks in the British House of Commons had the very unfortunate result for the Opposition of giving the Ministry a very large majority on one of their own motions which Mr. Chamberlain had denounced as a "dirty trick." Even if the breach had been patched up by the conference at Lord Salisbury's—which it apparently was not—it was one of those incidents which never leave things precisely as they were, because no formal reconciliation can ever convince the public out of doors that it is all over. Trouble was expected when Lord Randolph Churchill came back, not only because he once led the party in the House before he went away, but because his favorite rôle is the making of trouble. That his relations with the Salisbury family have long been much strained is well known, and when he makes himself unpleasant to them, it is difficult to make anybody believe he does not mean it.

He has made himself unpleasant on the present occasion by a rousing speech in opposition to the Government scheme for disestablishing the Welsh Church. The scheme does not propose actual present disestablishment. It simply provides that everybody who accepts a Welsh living hereafter shall take it with notice that he may lose it at any time by disestablishment, or, in other words, that no "vested interests" in the Welsh Church shall hereafter be created. No body had supposed that Lord Randolph took any particular interest in the Welsh or any other church. Everybody was, therefore, surprised when he rose at a late hour and delivered a slashing attack on the Ministry, apropos of the Welsh Church, and concerning nearly everything else. It was a speech which thoroughly roused the Tories by its vehemence, and directness, and rough-and-tumble eloquence. It reminded them of old times when they seemed to be routing the Radicals for good and all. It was most welcome, too, as a substitute for Mr. Balfour's very subtle and smart, but not particularly inspiring, dialectics, and must have set a good many Conservatives to asking themselves whether Churchill was not after all the coming man.

This speech, too, came at a time when the Tories were doubting more than ever whether home rule could be successfully resisted under Mr. Balfour's lead. For there is no denying that ever since Mr. Balfour's accession to the leadership, after Mr. Smith's death, they have been questioning themselves greatly whether they did not presume too much on his success in meeting the onslaughts of the Irish as Irish Secretary. These onslaughts had, by their extraordinary savagery and unscrupulousness, used up two of Balfour's predecessors, Sir George Trevelyan and Mr. Forster. When a man was found to meet them with smiles, and rather thrive under them than shrink from them, his party thrust an enormous amount of greatness on him. In fact, the rise of Mr. Balfour into eminence as not only a smart debater, but a great statesman, on the strength of his Irish administration, is one of the most curious episodes in English history. Its suddenness and rapidity was something unknown in English politics since the two Pitts, and showed in the most striking manner what a profound impression the Irish trouble had made on the English mind. In English politics men rise, as a rule, to the highest places very slowly, and through years of service in subordinate offices. Balfour rose from the position of a little-known idler, through two years of policing the Irish, to a place in the confidence of the party which no Tory Minister has held since the early days of Peel—for, though Disraeli was much admired, he was never wholly trusted. When it was found that Balfour was not by any means a skilful tactician, and that as a debater on general topics he was not even in the second rank, that he had none of Mr. Smith's skill in managing the discontented or mutinous, and that his dialectical skill was really available only for purposes of defence and recrimination, there was very great disappointment, and Churchill's appearance was very well timed.

To understand how serious this discontent is, it must be remembered that the main and loudly proclaimed reliance of the Conservatives has been on the fact that Gladstone's majority was so small, so heterogeneous, and so divided: it must, they thought, go to pieces either before the Home-Rule Bill was introduced or on its introduction. The plain duty of the Tory leader, therefore, was to seize every opportunity of breaking it up, and to withhold from it every occasion of showing strength or cohesion. This has not been done. On nearly every division, small and great, the Gladstonians have been allowed at least to hold their own. On most divisions, their vote has risen above their normal strength. The result has been the spread of despondency and lukewarmness among the Opposition rank and file, which the party organs have been trying to ascribe to their reserving their strength for the second reading of the bill. But this does not go down with the public, and the feeling that something is wrong with the leadership has been growing stronger for weeks, and has been increased by the debates, in which Balfour has distinctly played second fiddle to both Chamberlain and Goschen. There are signs, too, that Chamberlain has reached the stage, which he reached so soon in the Liberal ranks, of being tired of serving under anybody else. In other words, his stock of disinterested patriotism is plainly giving out. He has just made by far the best speech against the Home-Rule Bill on the Opposition side, and he is not the man to go on for ever rendering such services without recognition of some kind. That the late eruption has created much uneasiness in Conservative circles there can be little doubt, and Lord Salisbury is not the man to pour oil successfully on troubled waters.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TAINE AND THE SCIENCE OF CRITICISM.

In March, 1857, Sainte-Beuve devoted two of his *Causeries du Lundi* to the discussion of "Divers Écrits de M. H. Taine." He chose for special analysis Taine's 'Essai sur Tite-Live,' his Doctor's thesis on La Fontaine, which was later enlarged and republished, and his 'Philosophes Classiques du XIX^e^ Siècle.' Taine had taken his Doctor's degree only four years before, but he had marked each succeeding year with a work of first-rate importance; he had also published from time to time noteworthy essays on such widely different subjects as Xenophon, Saint-Simon, Guizot, and Mme. de la Fayette. In all these treatises and essays the comparatively unknown author had pleaded for and illustrated new methods and new aims in literary criticism. Yet, despite his youth and inexperience and venturesomeness, his work had shown none of the tentativeness or the weakness of first experiments. It became plainer with each new publication that the new critic was a man of genuine power and originality; and, accordingly, Sainte-Beuve, with characteristic grace and generosity, made haste to welcome him.

There is something almost dramatic in this first encounter between the two critics. Sainte-Beuve was the representative of the old tradition in criticism, while Taine was confessedly an innovator. The idealists and the romanticists who fared so ill at the hands of Taine, had many of them been personal friends of Sainte-Beuve. The idealistic tradition in literature with which Sainte-Beuve certainly sympathized, however completely he had rid himself of early romantic illusions, was the special object of Taine's contempt and ridicule. Again, Sainte-Beuve was the literary critic pure and simple; he had coquetted, it is true, with science, but he had never let his coquetries pass beyond the bounds of decorum or affect his professional work. Now, it was on science that Taine's whole method was founded; his terminology was drawn from science, and it was in the name of science that he came forward to reform literary criticism. Therefore, if Sainte-Beuve had in his favor the prestige of a great tradition, Taine on his side had the prestige of a popular catchword, for just at this time science was the cry of the hour, and realism was revenging itself for the romantic excesses of 1830.

Of the tact and skill with which, under these rather exacting conditions, Saint-Beuve acquits himself, there can be but one opinion: they are worthy of the great apostle of good taste. He recognizes at once Taine's scholarship, his curious maturity, his sureness of touch, his certainty of aim and of method. He speaks pleasantly of the duty that older men owe to such juniors as really "count"—that of scanning them well and coming to know them thoroughly. Moreover, to have to do with these newest arrivals tends to make you young again, even though the new-comers show their youth only by their vigor, and present themselves before you full-grown and full-armed. But it behooves you to be on your guard and to tighten your belt as you approach them.

This gracious and generous greeting, however, merely prepares the way for a very searching criticism of Taine's ideas and methods. Under guise of a tribute to Taine's thoroughness and scholarship, Sainte-Beuve at once suggests the points in which, he thinks, Taine most offends against the spirit and the ideals of good criticism. On the one hand, Taine is too desperately serious: he has the set look and the business-like bearing of a man in a laboratory, who handles hot crucibles and deals with dangerous compounds. On the other hand, Taine is too disputatious: he is always bent on proving a thesis; the air of the Sorbonne lecture-rooms clings about his volumes. These faults of bearing are for Sainte-Beuve significant of radical defects of temperament and of method. Taine does not put himself in touch with his author; he does not enter sympathetically into the spirit of the work he criticises; he uses his author for his own special purposes; he wrests his author's ideas into illustrations of his own pet theories; or, as Sainte-Beuve elsewhere puts it, the critic pulls the blankets all to his side of the bed.

These charges—though charges is too harsh and criminating a word for the suave insinuations of Sainte-Beuve—take up a large part of the first essay. But here and there in the first essay, and at still greater length in the second essay, Sainte-Beuve adopts a different point of view, and with admirable ingenuity turns Taine's own principles against him. The sum and substance of the earlier criticisms was that Taine was not an "appreciator," but a scientific student of literary forms and an historian of ideas; Sainte-Beuve's quarrel was with Taine's whole ideal. The later criticisms suggest that Taine is false to his own ideal; that while he is professing to reform literary criticism in the name of science and to put it on a scientific basis, he is constantly violating the laws of science and departing from the methods of scientific investigation. He is too much of a systematizer and too ambitious in his ideal constructions; he is impatient of doubt or uncertainty, and forges links out of nothing wherever there are breaks in the chain of his evidence. In attempting to sum up an individual under a formula he sins against science, by disregarding the infinite complexity of the problem and by using rough-and-ready methods for solving it. Before "talents" or characters can be classed or grouped under formulas, an almost endless series of observations must be made on all kinds of men and under a vast variety of conditions; to attempt to frame out of hand a few cheap formulas for typical characters is a radically unscientific mode of procedure.

By some of Sainte-Beuve's suggestions Taine undoubtedly profited; in his subsequent work he insists less dogmatically on the significance of "la faculté maîtresse" and on the possibility of finding a single phrase by which to sum up an individual in a formula. The parable of Adam naming the beasts of the field at the behest of the Lord had its effect. Taine's love of system, however, and his general methods of work remained unchanged. He was still invariably bent on proving a thesis, and he was as far as ever from being satisfied, after the manner of impressionistic critics, with merely dabbling in the standing pool of his feelings. Of the importance of method in the study of literature and of the value of his own method in its main features, Taine was as firmly convinced as ever; and his next great work, his 'Histoire de la littérature anglaise,' published in 1864, was constructed from first to last in illustration of his method and in obedience to his principles. In fact, the possibility of a scientific explanation of literature was the specific thesis which in this case Taine nailed up to be proved, and his 'History of English Literature' was merely the four-volume demonstration of a thirty-page theorem.

Certainly this work of Taine's must always stand as a superb *tour de force*. It is easy enough to carp at it; to disagree with this or that estimate; to blame the critic for overrating Byron and for doing scant justice to Shelley; to exclaim at the yeoman's service exacted from a few such terms as Berserker rage, Puritan cant, English stolidity, etc., etc.; to mock at French prejudice, and to accuse the critic of being mechanical and hard and unsympathetic, of turning everything into demonstration, and of being hypnotized by a theory. But, after the bitterest possible things have been said, it still remains true that the History is a magnificent achievement and a work of the greatest possible significance. Merely as a piece of literary engineering, it is a marvel of skill: its books, its chapters, and its sections are massed with a sure eye both for literary effect and for sequences of thought; and the table of contents alone is more stimulating reading than the texts of most histories of English literature. But, of course, what makes the book unique is its thorough-going attempt to explain a whole literature in terms of national character, inherited culture, and environment.

Not that the underlying principle on which Taine's method depends had not been enunciated long before. That principle is, of course, the historic continuity and the organic unity of national life; and for the earliest suggestion of that principle and the earliest development of a method somewhat in harmony with it, we should have to go back at least to Taine's great countryman, Montesquieu, whose 'De l'esprit des lois' was a more or less conscious attempt to find in all a nation's institutions and activities the expression of one moulding and guiding spirit. Later on, in the eighteenth century, the principle was grasped at least partially by Winckelmann, whose 'History of Ancient Art' recognized the relativity of the arts, and the essential and necessary connection between the life of a people and its art expression. It was Herder, however, who first realized all that the principle involved, and undertook to apply it systematically and in detail to the study of literature. Literary criticism, in passing into his hands from those of Lessing, was totally changed in scope, methods, and aims; it no longer sought to appraise the æsthetic value of pieces of literature according as they met or fell short of the abstract requirements of ideal standards; it studied literature historically, and regarded it as necessarily determined in form and in matter through its direct relation to the life of the people for whom and by whom it was produced. This conception of literature as an organic growth was one of the best gifts of Herder to Goethe, and from their day to our own it has been a commonplace of German literary criticism.

It is not, then, because of the originality of his fundamental principle that Taine's 'History of English Literature' is so important and significant a book. But nowhere else, unless in Scherer's 'Geschichte der deutschen Literatur,' has the principle in question been applied so brilliantly for the explanation of a whole national literature. The magnitude of the attempt, the importance of the subject, and the brilliancy of the execution, have insured the book a great vogue; and to-day, for most English readers, Taine stands as the one great representative of scientific method in the study of literature. Taine's work has done more to popularize the conception of literature as the direct and necessary expression of national life than all the numberless tomes of conscientious German philosophizing.

Then, again, with characteristic love of clearness, precision, and system, Taine tried to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

find a few ultimate forces in terms of which to express all the infinitely various influences that shape and color national life and determine its form and content. The result of this effort was the well-known *race, moment,* and *milieu* theory—a theory which, from its union of apparent simplicity and comprehensiveness, is always at first sight enormously taking, and seems to offer a perfect organon for literary investigation. The thoroughness, too, and the skill with which the influence of these ultimate forces is traced out in all the minor groups of social facts, in religion, philosophy, art, and science, are bound to be captivating, particularly to young students who are hungry for generalizations and eager to impose themselves on the facts that they handle. Perhaps the value of Taine's theory then depends fully as much on its stimulating power as on any absolute certainty that can be claimed either for its subordinate principles or for the conclusions to which it leads.

Attacks on the theory have from the first been plentiful. Among comparatively recent criticisms that of M. Émile Hennequin in 'La Critique Scientifique' is most interesting and suggestive. M. Hennequin appeared as a champion of "the great man" in history and literature. Under Taine's treatment "the great man" seemed in danger of being ruthlessly and prematurely resolved into his elements; M. Hennequin was bent on rescuing him and reconstituting him at any cost. "The great man," he insists, is not the product of his age: he fashions his age in his own image. He creates out of nothing a beautiful ideal, either of action or of passion, and imposes it on his sympathetic, impressionable, but uncreative contemporaries. He cannot be the mere product of his age, for both he and his very opposite may exist under precisely the same social conditions. Goethe and Schiller belonged to one and the same nation in one and the same age; so also with Hobbes and Milton, with Byron and Crabbe, with Scott and Landor, and with a host of other ill-mated couples, whom M. Hennequin holds up to the reader's scorn. The great man, then, is not the product of his age, but is a mysterious, original force, out of all explicable relation to his time except as he brings his time under the spell of his genius.

It is, of course, not at all difficult to see how all this can be met from Taine's point of view; the criticism, though clever, is not damaging or convincing. But certain conclusions that M. Hennequin draws from this form of the great-man theory are very interesting to the literary critic because of their practical applications. Society, M. Hennequin insists, can properly be studied only through its typical great men, whose ideals dominate various social groups, and whose temperaments are their followers' temperaments intensified and magnified. Now, for the successful study of these typical temperaments we must have, M. Hennequin urges, a thorough and elaborate system of psychological analysis, with points of view, methods, and terms which shall be used in common by all critics. This plea for co-operation among all critics in the thorough and systematic study of temperaments seems wholly in Taine's spirit, and suggests certain lines along which Taine's method can profitably be supplemented.

M. Hennequin, with a courage that may very well have come from youth and inexperience, has tried to outline a scheme for the scientific study of the temperaments of authors. It is easy for the ill-disposed to scoff at his elaborately determined points of view, at his ingenious terminology, and at his formal schedules of facts and conclusions. But it is nevertheless perfectly plain that some such scheme must be devised and put into practice if criticism is ever to become a science, as Taine and his followers have always been bent upon making it. Moreover, Taine himself recognized this need with perfect distinctness. In the eighth section of the introduction to his 'History of English Literature' he writes: "There is a particular system of inner impressions and operations which makes an artist, a believer, a musician, a painter, a man in a nomadic or social state; and of each the birth and growth, the connection of ideas and emotions, are different; each has his moral history and his special structure, with some governing disposition and some dominant feature. To explain each, it would be necessary to write a chapter of psychological analysis, and barely yet has such a method been rudely sketched." This passage may well enough have given M. Hennequin the first hint for his scheme of psychological analysis.

Taine never for a moment claimed completeness or finality for his method. He knew far better than his assailants the difficulty of his problems, and the necessary imperfections of any method that can yet be devised for dealing with them. But "his faith was large in time" and in the ultimate outcome of the coöperation of many ardent students along the lines he had sketched. In 1866, in his preface to 'Essais de critique et d'histoire,' he writes of the science of history: "Tel est le champ qui lui est ouvert; il n'a pas de limites; dans un pareil domaine, tous les efforts d'un homme ne peuvent le porter en avant que d'un ou deux pas; il observe un petit coin, puis un autre; de temps en temps il s'arrête pour indiquer la voie qui lui semble la plus courte et la plus sûre. C'est tout ce que j'essaye de faire: le plus vif plaisir d'un esprit qui travaille consiste dans la pensée du travail que les autres feront plus tard." This passage contains the very quintessence of Taine's spirit—his generosity in appreciating the work of others, his faith in the future, his indomitable energy, and his enthusiastic devotion to the task in hand. In his article on that prince of amateurs, Prosper Mérimée, he says of the need of fixity of purpose and of concentration: "Un homme ne produit tout ce dont il est capable que lorsque, ayant conçu quelque forme d'art, quelque méthode de science, bref, quelque idée générale, il la trouve si belle qu'il la préfère à tout, notamment à lui-même, et l'adore comme une déesse qu'il est trop heureux de servir." This fine singleness of purpose and strenuousness of pursuit characterizes all Taine's work in literature. The great debt we owe to his scholarship and to his philosophic insight is too constantly in our minds to need to find its way often into speech; but perhaps we are not so apt to realize how much he has done to redeem literary criticism from being a paltry juggling with fine phrases and to give it seriousness of purpose, dignity, and a recognized standing. He was accused of being a materialist; but in an age of *décadence*, when the descendants of the romanticists and idealists are for the most part engaged in dilettante experiments on their senses and emotions, such materialism as Taine's is as healthy as sea-air. It is no wonder that when, a week ago, the death of M. Taine was announced, many students of literature felt as though they had lost a personal friend.

THE HOME RULE BILL'S PROSPECTS.

LONDON, March 4, 1893.

YOU are already fully informed regarding the text of the Home Rule Bill, and have grasped the main features and details of a measure evincing acquaintance with your own Constitution and that of the great British colonial dependencies. It is, therefore, unnecessary here to discuss particulars. There are two points likely to be disapproved on the Nationalist side. One of these is a sentence in the fourth clause, declaring that "The powers of the Irish Legislature shall not extend to the making of any law whereby private property may be taken without just compensation." A bill has just been brought in by the Government, to enable localities, after three years' notice, to close public houses. Ireland is being excluded from the operation of this bill on the ground that under the Home Rule Bill she can legislate for herself. It must be made clear that the above sentence would not interfere with her right to deal with the liquor traffic. The second and main difficulty likely to arise is regarding Ireland's contribution to imperial expenses. The question has of late received much attention from economists. A remarkable pamphlet on the subject* appeared last year from an occasional contributor to the *Nation*, a writer unconnected with political parties. It is satisfactory that between his estimate of a fair contribution at £2,000,000 and that of the present bill, there is a difference of only £400,000 per annum. Yet this is £200,000 in excess of the proposal of 1886, which sum might be of considerable importance to Ireland, in her very backward position. She must disburse largely in almost every department to bring her institutions up to present requirements. The proposals under the bill would show for Ireland a nominal surplus of £500,000 a year over existing relations. That sum, added to all possible savings on present establishments, would, without the immediate imposition of extra taxation, be a totally inadequate basis for necessary expenditure. So much for Nationalist criticism.

For opponents, as to details, the main point of attack is the retention of the Irish members. So long as the right of home rule is accorded, the Irish people have at present no very strong predilections. In 1886 they were willing to accept exclusion. They are now, after seven years' consideration, on the whole desirous of inclusion. Exclusion was the chief factor in wrecking the bill of 1886. On inclusion the Conservatives now place their main hope of defeating the present bill. In considering a measure so utterly distasteful to them, there is nothing necessarily irrational in objecting to it from every point of view. Their inconsistency lay in professing to agree to the principle of local government. Even this charge of inconsistency no longer holds against either Conservatives or Liberal-Unionists. Seven years ago the one party professed to admit the principle of Irish local government, the other that of home rule. Both have meanwhile levelled down to the maintenance of ascendancy pure and simple.

It is impossible to foresee how long the discussion may continue or what may be the fate of the present measure. Full discussion may dissipate objections and bring the Opposition to reason. It may, on the other hand, still further inflame passion. At present it avails little to argue whether the bill does or does not mean separation, repeal, or the relegation of the minority bound hand and foot to the majority. The Opposition has so far, especially in Ireland, claimed, or really wrought itself up to believe, that the measure means all three.

*'The Financial Relations of Great Britain and Ireland.' By An Irishman. Dublin. 1892.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is amusing to note how wealthy men, declaring their lives and liberties are at stake, send a subscription of five dollars to avert the catastrophe, and how declarations that every interest in Ireland will be ruined are accompanied by the purchase of Irish "beared" stocks. We must doubt the sincerity of men who take the lead in maintaining that black disaster impends, and who have been latterly sinking more and more of their capital in bricks and mortar in Ireland. Nevertheless, a most bitter and formidable opposition is certainly brewing, such an opposition as, since the discussions regarding Catholic Emancipation and the Great Reform Bill, has not met any political change in the United Kingdom; more formidable in volume—in spirit in proportion to the increase of the effectiveness of political warfare within the past seventy years. Never did a statesman with the snows of eighty-three winters on his head face a storm such as that which Mr. Gladstone is about to encounter. Little wonder that when a deputation of supporters approached him the other day regarding the desirability of reform in another direction, he should have answered in effect, "My mental powers have their limits, which are already overstrained."

This opposition comes mainly from Ireland; its most serious effects are to be anticipated in its possible influence on the British electorate. That electorate was moved to the acceptance of home rule by various causes. Reason and conscience played their part. But beyond these, Parliamentary obstruction, a reign of despotism and heartless eviction, a series of imprisonments, embracing the incarceration as common criminals of town councillors, mayors, and members of Parliament, played no inconsiderable part. Obstruction, despotism, evictions, imprisonments have ceased. It remains now to be seen whether or not the British electorate will stand firm, and whether the frantic appeals and prognostications of Irish Protestants may not partly obliterate the lessons of the past. So far, it must be admitted, the expressions of Irish Protestant opinion in support of the 1886 bill are wanting in favor of the present measure. This is due, not, I believe, to any material change of feeling, but rather to the relentless social and business boycott established against those who have dared to show sympathy with the Nationalists. But to whatever cause attributable, the suppression of such feeling on the part of Irish Protestants must count against the measure. There are, it is true, a larger proportion than ever of Protestant Nationalist members of Parliament, but these members are steadily disowned as representing Protestant interests.

The very blindness of the Opposition may defeat itself. Parliament as at present constituted cannot continue to do its work. The United Kingdom excepted, all English-speaking communities are governed in their local affairs by parliaments, but one of which legislates for more than the population of Ireland, twenty-five of which legislate for smaller populations than that of Dublin. The British Parliament, which in 1801 had to rule 16,000,000, and followed the doctrine of *laissez faire* regarding social relations, has now to rule 38,000,000 on the principle of the interference of law in the minutest relations of life. This Parliament has besides taken upon itself, with a growing realization of the responsibility, the task of guiding the government of 300,000,000 in India. In so far as Parliament worked well in the past under its lighter burdens, it worked through a series of conventionalities as applied to procedure. Those conventionalities have perished in the storms of the last few years. It may be grand in theory that a member for Kerry or Orkney has as much right to interfere in the minutest affairs of the other 669 constituencies as in those of his own. But the theory is no longer practicable. Of the daily *agenda* nine-tenths are adjourned or scamped. Of the pile of documents daily delivered at the private residences of members, 99 per cent. are at once consigned to the waste-paper basket. The conception of a united Parliament to attend to everything, where one moment an empire is given away or assured, and another a discussion arises as to whether some poor woman in some Irish workhouse has received her proper allowance of rations, may be ideal, but it is not possible to carry out. The tactics of the Opposition in Parliament are in truth, day by day, emphasizing the necessity for change. Sooner or later will break down the impossible attempt to continue the transaction of committee business by what the *Chronicle* to-day styles "an unwieldy, turbulent, and ill-instructed assembly of 670 men." It is well for the Irish that it has suited them to cease obstruction, and that their opponents have had to assume the rôle, before obstruction meant the delay of domestic legislation keenly desired by the masses of the British democracy.

The Opposition in Ireland relies upon arguments which would tell equally against any form of local administration in that country. Under Mr. Gladstone's measure the minority would be assured better guarantees than under a system of local county government in which in twenty-seven out of thirty-two counties Protestants might be entirely unrepresented. Irish Protestantism has more to fear from intangible oppression in local assemblies than from the open application of illiberal feeling in a central legislature. It has most to fear from the establishment of a conviction in the minds of the Catholic masses that the Protestants alone stand in the way of the concession to Ireland of the management of her own affairs. No doubt the immediate disproportionate influence of the official classes in Ireland, who may be numbered at perhaps 25,000, and of the greater land-owners, perhaps 5,000, is more or less jeopardized by this bill. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ.* These classes, with their present social and political position, can influence many and effect much. It is not impossible that they may compass the defeat of the bill. If some such measure as the present is not accepted, the political condition of Ireland must year by year lag still further behind that of Great Britain; the conduct of the business of Parliament must become more and more difficult and involved; every question will be considered more and more, not in relation to its intrinsic merits, but in relation to the sustainment of one party and the injury of the other.

No one supposes that one-half of the 148 who against 229 voted the other day for bimetallism were really in favor of the nostrum. They voted in pursuance of a carefully devised trick to turn out the Government—a trick which might have succeeded but for the vigilance of the Liberal whips. By no process can Unionist doctrinaires eliminate the Irish vote from consideration. Even if the present number of Irish members were reduced, as it certainly would be if the Conservatives returned to power, a sufficient Nationalist representation would remain to complicate and obstruct business. The conflict is irrepressible. Sooner or later it must proceed to some issue. Were not the interests at stake so serious and pressing, and the demoralization under the present régime so widespread, many might feel tempted, from utter weariness of unnecessary striving, to stand aside, convinced that the present is only part of a movement that cannot ultimately be resisted, for the reconstruction of the British Constitution upon less cumbrous and more democratic lines—a movement that really depends more on the great current of progress than on Parliamentary majorities and frantic appeals to party and class rancor and religious bigotry. D. B.

TWO INTERPELLATIONS.

PARIS, February 23, 1893.

WITHIN the last fortnight we have had at the Chamber two interpellations which have made a good deal of stir. After the first, many people imagined we were going to witness a great political overthrow, and that all of a sudden the Panama affair was about to produce a direct and immediate change in the Government's line of policy. The second interpellation has shown these hopes or these fears to be vain. The events which have just occurred in the two Chambers nevertheless merit attention, as furnishing a study taken from the life of the opposing parties in Parliament.

In order the better to understand the meaning and the bearing of the various recent Parliamentary manœuvres, it is necessary not to lose sight of the party divisions at present existing in the Chamber of Deputies. The Right, it will be remembered, still comprises the Royalist and Conservative parties; for notwithstanding that a restoration of the monarchy becomes every day less and less probable, a certain number of Deputies continue to advocate it. The other members of the Right—those who, as I have had occasion to remark in a preceding letter, recognize the hopelessness of any attempt to restore the monarchy, and who therefore have declared their adhesion to the Republic—are denominated in current political language "Ralliés."

In contradistinction to the Right, and in constant opposition to it, is the Left, on which the Goverument depends for support, and which is itself also subdivided into a certain number of sections, shading off from the Left Centre, which does not greatly differ from the more moderate section of the Right, to the most extreme Socialist groups. No one of these sections is by itself sufficiently strong to constitute alone a stable Ministerial majority; and so the various Ministries that have followed each other in rapid succession for some years past have all been coalition Ministries, counting among them representatives of the different sections of the Republican majority. Hence it results that the Ministry is forced, on the occasion of every vote, to bargain for its majority, and consequently to deviate from its original line of policy; and experience has shown that in these compromises moderate ideas are always sacrificed to the profit of more advanced tendencies. Thus, for instance, since M. Ribot has been in power, he has been gradually drawn in his political policy nearer to the side of the Extreme Left; and a member of Parliament a day or two ago was able with justness to exclaim, "Where does M. Ribot come from?" "From the Left Centre." "Where is he going to?" "Towards Radicalism." But this evolution is evidently not calculated to please the moderate Republicans, who, with the advent of M. Ribot, thought to see one of their own party at the head of affairs. It is only natural, therefore, that they should try to make the Government turn back,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and should endeavor to obtain again the influence they thought they once possessed in its councils.

In effecting this they are able to count on the support of the "Ralliés," who, if they have accepted the republican form of government, nevertheless wish to have a moderate, almost a conservative, Republic. Moreover, in the case of their making any attack on the Government, the Right and Left Centres will always be sure of being supported by the Right, which, by a kind of absolute principle, always votes against the Ministry, however it be composed. A manœuvre of this kind, however, can succeed only under special conditions. Recent events seemed to supply these conditions; and hence the attack we have witnessed, for the making of which the Panama affair furnished the pretext. It is hardly necessary to allude to the various discoveries connected with this affair—the receiving of bribes by Deputies, the interference of foreign adventurers in our politics, and last, but not least, the fact that the Government had made use of some of the Panama money for a political purpose at a time when M. Floquet was President of the Council. In spite of the Committee of Inquiry and the trial for bribery and breach of contract, it could not be said that the matter was cleared up. The Chamber had refused to reëlect M. Floquet President; but the Ministry had not always maintained a consistent attitude, and there was no definite conviction that it was willing to go through with the affair to the end, and, by thoroughly settling it, to separate itself entirely from the individuals or groups compromised in this unhappy business. Such was the state of things when, on the 8th of this month, an obscure Deputy of the rank and file managed to initiate an interpellation on the Panama affair. The debate seemed likely to have no importance, when, without any warning, there mounted the tribune a personal friend and former political colleague of M. Ribot, no other than M. Godefroi Cavaignac, a former Minister of the Marine, who has great weight in the Chamber, and who is certainly the most prominent member of the moderate Left. His speech, very short and very simple, confined itself to an appeal to the Government to make a thorough examination, and at the same time to break once for all with the past ministerial practices condemned by the country at large. This speech, chaste in form and moderate in expression, but yet at bottom full of fire, as dealing with principles and nowise with the Chamber's confidence in the Government of the day, aroused a tremendous enthusiasm. The resolution proposed by M. Cavaignac was voted by a very large majority, and the posting up of the speech throughout the country was in addition ordered by the Chamber. This latter course is generally adopted when important declarations have been made by the Government, and consists in the official placarding throughout all the communes of France of the part of the Parliamentary report in question.

The intervention of M. Cavaignac had completely disconcerted the Ministry. It agreed to the resolution, but the vote was none the less a blow to it on account of the way in which the incident had occurred. This speech was directed against the Government, or at any rate against the majority it had hitherto depended on. Therein it saw the germ of a coalition of the Centres and of certain elements of the Right; in short, it felt that the Chamber was abandoning its allegiance. The various sections of the Republican majority drew on the morrow the same conclusions; the Deputies that had applauded M. Cavaignac with the most enthusiasm, themselves perceived, side by side with the question of political honesty and morality to which many were quite ready to agree, the existence of another question exclusively political. Unwilling to see the Centres gain the upper hand, they were therefore quite disposed to offer the Ministry an occasion of recovering its influence in the Chamber. The Government on its side was equally desirous of obtaining a formal vote of confidence. For this, an interpellation was necessary; and, having been carefully prepared, a week after the first this second interpellation took place.

Duly announced and anxiously anticipated, the Parliamentary sitting devoted to this debate disappointed every expectation. M. Ribot developed in wearisome iteration the theme of Republican concentration and, if necessary, union among the Republican party-sections—a doctrine which, it may be said, by the way, permits ministries to hang on, but corresponds in reality to nothing very definite; for the same Deputies who agree to vote in favor of the Government are often enough, politically speaking, in complete disagreement one with another.

M. Cavaignac came forward a second time to repeat what he said a week before, and certain other members delivered themselves of diatribes more or less violent and more or less ingenious against the policy of the Cabinet; but their success was of the most meagre kind. The President of the Council himself was far from being covered with applause; but in reality that did not much matter, as the majority had decided beforehand to back him up. And back him up it did, the vote of confidence that the Government accepted being passed by an imposing phalanx; and the Ribot Cabinet, which the week before had been tottering, was once more consolidated.

The word "consolidated" is not, perhaps, the most proper to be applied in this case, for, as a matter of fact, the Ministry's position remains the same to-day as it was a week or so ago, to wit, in a state of unstable equilibrium which may be maintained for some time, but which is quite as likely as not to be destroyed at any moment. Such are the fatal consequences of the absence of a homogeneous majority in the Chamber—the concentration that to-day sustains the Ministry may fall to pieces to-morrow, and in its place may possibly be formed another concentration, another fortuitous grouping of fragmentary parties in the Chamber. At the same time it would seem—and this is another conclusion to be drawn from these recent events—that if, as some people predict, the "Ralliés" and the Centres are to accede to power, and are to give us, instead of the growingly radical Republic which we have at present, a Conservative Republic of the kind M. Thiers extolled, it is not through the existing Chamber that such a result can be brought about, and that, for this *volte-face* to take place, the general elections next October should give returns different from the last—a contingency which for the moment is doubtful. But to know if this can happen, one needs to come back to the question of the influence the Panama affair is likely to have on political ideas, and on this ground I do not wish to venture. To be able to write sensibly and impartially on this subject, one needs to wait for the result of the legal preliminary examination, as also of the judgment of the Indictment Court and of the trial for bribery and corruption. Then, and then only, will it be possible to sum up the whole affair, and to elucidate all the various tendencies one sees looming through it, much more complex than one is at first tempted to believe. S.

THE KELMSCOTT PRESS.

London, February 25, 1893.

In many ways, the appearance of Mr. Morris as a "master-printer" is one of the most interesting events in the history of modern bookmaking. He is accepted as such an authority on all branches of decorative art, he has so often railed against the abomination of American printing in particular and the iniquity of nineteenth-century publishing in general, he has been so given to dogmatize on the nature of the perfect book, that, now he has himself taken to printing and publishing, one looks with much curiosity and some eagerness to the volumes from his own press, which must be supposed to represent the realization of his ideal. That he is free to realize this ideal, that he cannot make cheapness an excuse for shortcomings, is at once explained by the prices he asks. Mr. Morris's Socialism has always been as feeble in practice as it is violent in theory. All men may be equal in his eyes, the proletariat he may think shamefully neglected; but when it comes to the making of books, why, then it is only the capitalist he considers. The Kelmscott Press has the distinction of producing the most costly books of the day, and this though the expenses in connection with them are comparatively small. In reprinting old works, there are no royalties or half profits to be considered; in Mr. Morris's more modern ventures, only once or twice have the interests of any living author, except himself, been at stake.

The literary importance of his publications is a question apart, though the first new edition of Caxton's 'Golden Legend' issued in 350 years cannot be passed over entirely in silence. But still, as Mr. Morris explained to an interviewer only the other day, his object in starting the Kelmscott Press was to amuse himself and to print some nice books; he is not concerned with their direct influence on literature. It is enough, therefore, to say that his choice is delightfully characteristic. Of the thirteen volumes printed, or to be printed, several are his own poems and tales, the others, with one or two exceptions, the earliest English books. Mr. Morris, in his work, no matter of what kind, would rather be anything than modern.

If his literary prejudices are thus made manifest, his oft-proclaimed artistic dogmas are no less apparent in his type, his treatment of the page, his binding. It has always been a weakness with him to limit his artistic appreciation to certain periods and certain schools, and in these to see only good. In his devotion, even defects due to the immature development of an art or craft become qualities to be worshipped and, if possible, reproduced. In many respects, the first books published are the most beautiful ever produced, but they were not without drawbacks. Of the three fonts used at the Kelmscott Press, two are of the nature of Gothic, not absolute copies of the old German type, but adaptations, in which, however, much of the old obscurity is retained. It was very well for early printers to take as models the handwriting, not of the day, as Mr. Morris is always erroneously stating, but of the professional scribes, corresponding, as it were, to our conveyancers; it was inevitable that they should. But that is no reason why their designs should not now be improved upon. One of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

latest and most successful of Mr. Morris's books is his reprint, not by any means a facsimile, of Caxton's 'Recuyell of Troye.' To look at the page is a delight; it is fairly well printed; it is well spaced, its stern simplicity relieved only by the capitals at the beginning of the paragraphs, by the quiet design on the margin at their side, by the red ink in which the headings of the chapters are given. But if you come to read the page it is a task, requiring continual effort. There can be no genuine pleasure without ease in reading, and the presumption is that even Mr. Morris's books are intended to be read. The third font is Roman, the Venetian printers of the fifteenth century having been his guides, if not absolutely his masters in the designing of it. This is much better. To turn from the 'Troye' to the 'Golden Legend,' another of his last and most ambitious productions, in which Roman type has been used, is a vast relief, and the page loses nothing in effect. But beautiful type does not insure good printing; neither does the use of a hand-press, though Mr. Morris seems to believe that to say that a thing is done by hand is a guarantee of its excellence. There are pages in his books so slovenly and careless that the American printer he despises would rather have thrown them away than presented them as specimens, even of cheap printing, to the public.

Of actual book-illustration or decoration, there has as yet been little in the Kelmscott Press publications, though an edition of Chaucer, with numerous drawings by Mr. Burne-Jones, is promised. Hitherto Mr. Morris has concerned himself chiefly with beauty of type and harmony of proportions in the page. In the earlier productions, the 'Love Lyrics and Songs of Proteus' and Ruskin's 'Gothic Architecture,' for instance, a decorative border at the beginning of each book and initial letters are the only attempts at ornament; even the t[illegible]page carries austerity of design to such a[illegible] to suggest that more elaboration, if it [illegible] a more effectively balanced design, would be an improvement. But it is in these very initials and borders that Mr. Morris at once invites criticism. It must be remembered that, for all his books, a price far above the average is asked. Economy in the making is, therefore, the last feature to be expected in them; and yet the evidence of thrift is aggressive. The same initials appear over and over again, not merely in the same volume (a repetition most irritating in the 'Proteus,' where, oftener than once, a letter faces its replica on the opposite page); but in both books the identical designs have been used for the initials and even for the borders.

In these first publications, however, Mr. Morris may be said to have been feeling his way. It is more just, perhaps, to consider instead the last two, the 'Golden Legend' and the 'Recuyell of Troye.' Here there is more variety in the initials, but the old ones are once more made to do service, while, much as the types differ—in one book Roman, in the other Gothic—occasionally the same capitals appear in both, and the marginal decoration that ought to give distinct character to the 'Troye' occurs here and there in the 'Golden Legend.' But the most glaring economical dodge (it does not deserve a more dignified name) is to be seen in the two title-pages. In each the title is in large, bold lettering on a background of arabesques surrounded by a border, the latter repeated on the opposite or opening page; in both, though the background is slightly varied, the same border is used. Mr. Morris has ever been among those who preach the necessity of appropriateness in book decoration; to quote a homely old saying, one should practise what one preaches. But whatever Mr. Morris expects of other book-makers, he seems to think that for himself appropriateness consists in turning his stock of designs to most account. What matter if type in one case be Roman, in the other Gothic? He must get his money's worth out of the borders and capitals on hand.

Otherwise the get-up of both these books is to be commended. The 'Recuyell of Troye' is in two not too heavy or unwieldy volumes; the paper, as in all Mr. Morris's other publications, is hand-made, of Kentish manufacture, but it might easily be better and heavier. The binding is in white vellum, which Mr. Morris prefers to the poor quality of leather to be had nowadays; or, is it that he has found leather to be too expensive and the leather-maker not a comrade? The 'Golden Legend,' in three large shapely volumes, in blue paper and gray-linen covers, "strong-backed and neat-bound," as Charles Lamb would have liked to see them, is further adorned by two wood-cuts after Burne-Jones, archaic and Burne-Jonesian to the last degree, and yet with a decorative grace, while their primitiveness is not out of keeping with type and text.

When it must be admitted that Mr. Morris has done much to restore the book to its original dignity, it may seem a waste of judgment to find fault rather than to praise. But it is simply because his work is good up to a certain point that it challenges severe criticism. His books, according to him, smack so little of commerce, though probably few publishers make such goodly profits, that his economies of time, money, and labor are the more irritating. Besides, he has been so boisterous and prejudiced in condemning all modern bookmaking that it is his own fault if one looks to him for perfection, and, not finding it, becomes but doubly conscious of his failure. And again, already the Kelmscott Press is influencing the trades—or arts, if you will—of printing and publishing. Distinct imitations of his books are beginning to appear. Even his scheme of page decoration is being quietly appropriated, while there is a youth in London, Mr. Aubrey Beardsley, of whom more will probably be heard later on, who has borrowed the lines and tricks of Burne-Jones, until the process blocks after his drawings for a new edition of Mallory's 'Morte D'Arthur,' now in the press, are scarce to be distinguished in quality and effect from the woodcuts in the 'Golden Legend.' As for the presswork, produced by a steam press, it is almost equal to Mr. Morris's, while in the degree of care and attention bestowed upon the decorations there is simply no comparison. Yet Dent's book will cost not many more shillings than Mr. Morris's does pounds.

As to the ultimate fate of the Kelmscott Press publications, one cannot but wonder. One of Mr. Morris's henchmen has informed an expectant world that in the end books, as well as land, will be nationalized. But as Mr. Morris issues the most limited editions, it follows that, even when the millennium has come, some few millions of people will have to do without his perfect volumes. On the other hand, he is rapidly lessening the chances of their becoming the special and treasured possession of the collector. Just at present, those that have been published are going up in price; but he is turning out so many books that, though the editions of each be limited, they cannot long retain the virtue of rarity, especially if he perseveres in the practice of repeating the same designs in all. Only books like the promised Chaucer with Burne-Jones's illustrations will prove of distinct value, and their value will not be due to Mr. Morris's share in their production.

N. N.

Correspondence.

UNSECTARIAN THEOLOGY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I am glad to see your comment (in your issue of March 2) upon the singular proposal in the Report of the Harvard Divinity School to have "different systems of Theology" taught in the School by professors of different denominations. To most of us it seems plain that if systematic theology, or any other province of theology, cannot be taught by university methods, with a view simply to historic truth, then the whole idea of unsectarian theology, for which the Harvard Divinity School has always stood, comes to naught. The essence of non-sectarianism in education is not the handling of religious problems by experts of various beliefs, from whose teachings the student is to take his choice, but the handling of them in the broader aspects under which the question of truth alone comes into account, and where all denominations are forgotten. If this is impossible in systematic theology, or in philosophy, as the Report intimates, then systematic theology and philosophy are not properly university studies, but esoteric sciences, to be imparted only by the initiated or by special advocates.

In this case they stand below such studies as political economy, which Harvard College, I believe, claims to teach not under the form of protection or free trade, but on its own merits, and as a branch of pure science. If non-sectarian theology or philosophy does not "draw," the remedy would seem to be to enlarge its scope and constantly improve its quality. It is hardly the function of a university to follow the methods of scholarship so long as they prove easy, and abandon them the moment they grow difficult or fail to meet the popular demand.

E. H. H.

Cambridge, March 10, 1893.

THE JESUIT PASCAL.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I do not read the *North American Review*, but when the kindly gods cast before me such a thing of joy as this delicious passage from the number for March, I begin to wonder whether my life without it these many years has not been a ghastly waste of opportunities. It is from a "symposium" on the subject of "Insurance," p. 314:

"The problem was too difficult for him, and he sought the aid of the famous Abbe [*sic*] Blaise Pascal, *a Jesuit priest, author of 'Night Thoughts.'*"

But is not this carrying the "nullum discrimen" which is guaranteed upon the cover, to something like hyperbole?

T. B.

Rochester, March 16, 1893.

DE LESSEPS ANTICIPATED.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In his testimony before the Assize Court at Paris on the 8th inst., M. Charles de Lesseps is reported as having declared that "he took pride in saying that his father first conceived the idea of piercing the Isthmus of Panama."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An essay of Sir Thomas Browne's entitled "Of the River Nilus" ends with this paragraph:

"Nor will the ill success of some be made a sufficient determent unto others who know that many learned men affirm that islands were not from the beginning, that many have been made since by art, that some isthmuses have been eat through by the sea and others cut by the spade, and, if policy would permit, that of Panama in America were most worthy the attempt, it being but a few miles over, and would open a shorter cut into the East Indies and China."

I quote from Bohn's modernized edition of 'The Works of Sir Thomas Browne,' published in London in 1852. Attached to the essay is the following note in the original style:

"Betweene Panama and the Nombre de Dios, which lyes on bothe sides that strip of lande, the Spaniards accompte about 40 miles at most. . . . Butt itt withall supposes that to cut through the ridge of mountains which lies betweene those 2 havens is impossible and would prove more unfecible then that of Ægypt, which yf itt might be compassed would be of more advantage to these 3 parts of the world than that of Panama and nearer by 1000 leagues to us, the remotest Kingdome trading o the East Indyes."

Sir Thomas Browne was born in 1605 and died in 1682. The above essay was probably published after his 'Religio Medici,' and about 1650.—Yours respectfully,

J. Shipley Newlin.

Philadelphia, March 10, 1893.

A FORERUNNER OF LINCOLN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It seems worthy of notice that more than half a century before Lincoln's famous speech on his nomination to the United States Senate the same warning note, in connection with the slavery question, was sounded by a Philadelphia Quaker. "A house divided against itself cannot stand," says John Parrish, in his 'Remarks on the Slavery of the Black People' (1806); and he adds, "neither can a government or constitution" (p. 9). Lincoln's use of the Scriptural figure is more effective than the earlier author's. He not only hits the nail on the head, but drives it home. Lincoln, moreover, is referring to a sectional division, with the anticipation, not that the house will fall, not that the Union will be dissolved, but that it will become either all slave or all free. Parrish is referring to a condition in which one half of the citizens trample on the rights of the other; and his idea of the issue is based on a religious conviction that the cry of the oppressed will be heard.

"There is a God that judgeth the earth," is the continual cry of this Jeremiah. We cannot hope for a long continuance of God's blessing upon a government which neglects or refuses its duty to these people (p. 24). Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness (p. 29). The only sure foundation of government is the principle, "Do unto all men as ye would that they should do unto you" (p. 14). He declares that "all the combinations of human policy shall not be able to prevent the deliverance of this people from their wretched state of thraldom" (p. 7), and that, when they become free, "it is desirable it should be with the consent of those who have authority over them" (p. 41).

It is interesting to find, in this connection, one of the few existing protests against the first fugitive-slave law. Parrish attacks it partly on account of the injustice of its provisions (p. 12), and partly on the ground that it is based on a perversion of the Constitution. He argues that no service or labor can be due from a person deprived of his natural right, and that such an application of the constitutional clause would be manifestly inconsistent with the principles upon which this Government was founded (p. 32). The law of 1793, though less bitterly opposed than its successor, evidently contributed its mite towards nourishing anti-slavery sentiment.

Parrish's constitutional position is not altogether sound, but his insight into the slavery question is somewhat remarkable. He not only realizes the seriousness of the situation, but has a keen eye for specific abuses, and suggests definite remedies. The domestic as well as the foreign slave trade should be stopped; and he suggests that the State legislatures might prohibit transportation through their respective territories (p. 31). Not only must the importation of slaves be prohibited at the earliest possible moment, but something should be done to relieve those already under the lash, and that can be begun at once (p. 39). He suggests that a Congress which had power to make laws for the oppression of the slave, as in 1793, was surely competent also to do something to ameliorate his condition, and that the District of Columbia would be a suitable place to begin (p. 15). He argues in favor of emancipation (pp. 23 to 25 and *passim*), and advocates the scheme of colonization on Western territory, where he fondly imagines that "there are millions of acres likely to continue many ages unoccupied" (p. 43).

There was so much weak optimism among the anti-slavery writers of Parrish's day, such a disposition to defer all action until 1808, and such a comfortable expectation that after that time slavery would die a natural death, that it is cheering to find this vigorous plea for immediate action.—Yours very truly,

Mary Stoughton Locke.

Cambridge, Mass., March 4, 1893.

LECONTE DE LISLE IN THE ACADEMY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: May I venture to correct an error in your issue of February 9? In the communication on "Poetry in France" your Paris correspondent writes: "Whenever there was an Academical election, Victor Hugo . . . used invariably to write on his bulletin 'Leconte de Lisle,' till Leconte de Lisle was elected." The implication is that Hugo voted at the election in which Leconte de Lisle finally triumphed. As a matter of fact, however, Leconte de Lisle was elected to fill the Academy *fauteuil* left vacant by Victor Hugo's death.

M. Jules Lemaître, in the second series of his 'Impressions de Théâtre,' has given an amusing account of Leconte de Lisle's reception at the Academy, on which occasion Alexandre Dumas, *fils*, was spokesman of the august body. To quote M. Lemaître, who seizes the whole humor of the situation: "Il y avait en présence deux esprits n'aimant rien l'un à l'autre, ne comprenant absolument rien l'un à l'autre, obligés de se congratuler et d'exalter un troisième esprit qu'ils admirent, je crois, mais qu'ils n'aiment ni l'un ni l'autre." The whole account is delightful.

At the beginning of the communication from your correspondent there is another slight error, a manifest slip of the pen (or a misprint?), where Chénier, Dorat, etc., are spoken of as poets of the *seventeenth* century.

Very truly, R. E. N. D.

Paris, March 1, 1893.

MORALE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I do not remember to have seen in any previous number of the *Nation* a mistake which occurs on page 113 of No. 1445. I read there: "upon the conduct of Napoleon and upon the *morale* of his men." The writer was certainly not concerning himself with the morals of the men, but with their spirit; and he should have written *moral*—unless he preferred an English word of precisely the same meaning, in which case he could have written *spirit*.

I should not trouble you with this letter if the error could be regarded as a mere slip of the pen. It is one that is so habitual with English and American writers that there is great danger it may get to be correct through universal use. The London *Spectator* is a constant offender. Col. Dodge uses the word throughout his Life of Cæsar. We should smile if a Frenchman said he admired the morals of our army at Gettysburg; and we make the same mistake every day ourselves.

May I add, without trespassing too much on your space, that nine people out of ten say *savoir faire* when they mean *savoir vivre*—praising another's skill when they mean to praise his tact? And, finally, let me note that there is not and never was such a thing as a *double entendre;* that is, if the words are meant for French. If they are English, I do not know how to pronounce them, and should like to be told. A. D.

["If the words are meant for French." Precisely. *Morale* is no more meant for French than *bouquet*, and its use as English is so convenient and so well established (see the 'Century Dictionary,' *s. v.*), that it ought no longer to be italicized, unless, perhaps, as an aid in pronunciation. *Nom de plume* is another naturalized adaptation from the French. Hardly less unfamiliar to French eyes is *esprit d'escalier*—but who would hesitate to employ it though it be only the happy invention of a foreigner?—Ed. Nation]

Notes.

Charles Scribner's Sons have in press 'Wagner and his Works: The Story of his Life, with Critical Comments,' by Henry T. Finck; 'Recollections of Middle Life,' by Francisque Sarcey; 'Abelard, and the Origin and Early History of Universities,' by Jules Gabriel Compayré; 'Homes in City and Country,' reprinted from *Scribner's Magazine;* 'How to Know the Wild Flowers,' by Mrs. William Starr Dana and Marion Satterlee; Mrs. Burnett's 'The One I Knew the Best of All'; 'Island Nights' Entertainments,' by Robert Louis Stevenson, and 'A Second Book of Verse,' by Eugene Field.

In the early summer Harper & Brothers will bring out a new historical romance by Gen. Lew Wallace, 'The Prince of India; or, Why Constantinople Fell.' Meantime, they are about to issue 'Whittier: Notes of his Life and of his Friendships,' by Mrs. Annie Fields; Miss Wilkins's drama, 'Giles Corey, Yeoman'; Amélie Rives's tragedy, 'Athelwold'; 'The Japanese Bride,' by Naomi Tamura; 'Katharine North,' by Maria Louise Pool; 'White Birches,' by Annie Eliot, and 'Coffee and Repartee,' by John Kendrick Bangs.

Charles L. Webster & Co. have nearly ready

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a new volume of short stories by Mark Twain.

'The Eloping Angels' is the title of a new poem by William Watson, which Macmillan & Co. will publish.

G. P. Putnam's Sons have in preparation new illustrated editions of 'Old Court Life in France,' by Frances Elliot, and 'Woman in France during the 18th Century,' by Julia Kavanagh.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co.'s announcements include 'Socialism and the American Spirit,' by the Rev. N. P. Gilman; 'Tools and the Man,' by the Rev. Washington Gladden; 'The Gospel of Paul,' by Prof. C. C. Everett of the Harvard Divinity School; 'The Story of Malta,' by M. M. Ballou; 'Horatian Echoes,' translations by the late John O. Sargent; an anthology of 'Greek Masterpieces,' by Prof. W. H. Appleton of Swarthmore College; and 'A Wayside Harp,' by Louise Imogen Guiney.

D. Lothrop Co. publish for Easter 'A Song of the Christ,' by Harriet Adams Sawyer; 'Whittier with the Children,' by Margaret Sidney; and 'The Tennyson Remembrance Book,' by Elbridge S. Brooks.

Ginn & Co. will issue 'A Practical Course in English Composition,' by Prof. Alphonso G. Newcomer of the Leland Stanford Junior University.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is about to publish a digest of its proceedings, journals, MSS., letters, and reports, with a record of all the missionaries whom it has supported, from the date of its incorporation in 1701 to the present time. The first part will relate principally to the history of the Episcopal Church in this country, where, up to the Revolution, the Society spent nearly three-quarters of a million of dollars. Among the numerous portraits will be one of the first American Bishop, Seabury, and the first missionary, the learned Scotchman George Keith, who was sent over in 1702 to labor in Pennsylvania.

'Marriage,' in two volumes, by Miss Ferrier, comes to us from Roberts Bros., Boston, who aim, in their reprint of this and the two companion novels by the same author—her total production—to restore the text in its original fulness. Never, they say, has any but the first edition escaped curtailment. The series intentionally matches in appearance Miss Austen's as brought out by Roberts Bros. last year, and each volume has an etched frontispiece by Frank T. Merrill. Vol. i. opens with a biographical sketch of Miss Ferrier from *Temple Bar*, in which are marshalled the flattering opinions of contemporary critics from Sir Walter Scott down. And after this comes Miss Ferrier's account of her visits to Ashestiel and Abbotsford. To link her novels with Jane Austen's is natural and proper for the substance of them, though time has dealt very differently with the Scotch and the English woman in respect of fame and remembrance.

'The Black Dwarf' and 'A Legend of Montrose' compose the fifth volume of the Dryburgh Edition of the Waverley Novels (Macmillan), and each story has a separate artist assigned to it for the illustrations, which offer a considerable contrast in style. It is curious to remark that the juxtaposition of these tales brings together between two covers these parallel passages: "Grippie for grippie, friend," says Hobbie Elliot in the 'Black Dwarf' to Sir Frederick Langley, "I'll wad a wether he'll make the bluid spin frae under your nails." "As he [McAulay in the 'Legend'] spoke, he seized the Earl's hand and wrung it with such frantic earnestness that his grasp forced the blood to start under the nails."

Mr. Keltie's 'Statesman's Year-Book for 1893' (Macmillan) reaches its thirtieth issue, and calls for no description or eulogy. Its maps this year illustrate the frontier question of the Pamirs and the possible complications growing out of the dividing up of Africa by the European Powers. Some convenient tables have been placed in the front of the annual: the great cities of the world with 100,000 inhabitants and upwards; the world's wheat crops; production of gold and silver, merchant marine; the trade of Africa in 1891; the British Empire, 1891-92. There are other improvements in this very useful work, but they do not need to be pointed out.

Two of the Harper periodicals for 1892, bound volumes of which reach us from the publishers, bear testimony, silent and spoken, to the loss of Mr. Curtis—the break in the *Weekly* caused by his death being more immediate and marked than in the *Monthly*, where his last Easy Chair, written with the long anticipation of magazine copy, stands side by side with his obituary in the November number. The *Weekly* reveals other changes than the absence of his pen in the editorial columns—a new department, "Music and Drama," having been introduced towards the end of the year, and sharper prominence having been given to illustrations and letterpress of a sort new to the "old subscriber." For the rest, its pictorial chronicle of current events is as full and interesting as ever, adequately covering a year notable for memorable political and industrial struggles.

The *Monthly* has lost another frequent contributor of long standing through the dropping by the way of Theodore Child, several of whose articles on things and persons Parisian appear in these volumes. His successor, in point of voluminousness, appears to be Mr. Julian Ralph, whose pen has been let loose upon this hemisphere and had covered the region from Hudson's Bay to St. Louis by the end of Vol. 85. The year saw the close of the valuable series on the "Armies of To-day" and of Mr. Besant's papers on historic London. Lowell's lectures on the Old English Dramatists, with Bridge's reminiscences of Hawthorne and Mrs. Ritchie's of the Brownings, were the chief literary features.

The precession of the fashions in the *Bazar* gives the usual impression of mystery and fate combined. From clothes to faces a welcome transition is made in Mr. Child's "Mirror of Fair Women," with its profuse illustration. A series of slight sketches and gossip about art and travel and manners runs through the year under the title of "Mrs. Wouter Van Twiller's Saturdays," the more serious note being left to Col. Higginson in his "Women and Men" column. Mr. Besant furnishes the main serial story, and there is the usual miscellany about house and home and season and custom, with a long list of cookery recipes which are as condensed in form as Dr. Johnson could have desired, though whether as thoroughly "philosophical" as he would have made his cook-book we cannot say.

Whether the fifteen-year-old Eton boy for whom Mr. Reginald Baliol Brett wrote 'Footsteps of Statesmen during the Eighteenth Century in England' (Macmillan) was altogether to be congratulated, may well be doubted. Two-thirds of it must have been unintelligible to him, unless he was unhealthily precocious. Mr. Brett has, therefore, wisely placed the book before a more mature audience. It is an entertaining series of gossipy sketches, to be read in comfort over a pipe by men who know something of political affairs in England, and do not take too strenuous a view of things. They will find in them a mild Whig doctrine, an indefinable air of aristocratic superiority to the vulgar herd, and not a few shrewd touches. The hardly veiled allusions to modern politicians add to the gentle interest. Thus, Bolingbroke's "acceptance of office under Harley, his intrigues to overturn him, his momentarily obtained and forever-lost leadership, almost entitle him to rank as member for some great metropolitan constituency." We should like to know what Mr. Brett thinks of the member for Paddington's chances of the leadership now. In style the work is uneven; many of the sentences are awkward and involved, and grandiose phrases, such as the reference to the *Times* as "the diurnal literary miracle which emanates at an early hour from Printing-House Square," are not infrequent.

An account of 'Coal Pits and Pitmen' might easily be made interesting as well as instructive, but the book so entitled, by R. Nelson Boyd (Macmillan), is neither. It is concerned with coal-mining in Great Britain only. It gives little intelligible information concerning the methods pursued in the industry, and is principally occupied with the tedious details of the numerous Parliamentary measures regulating the working of collieries. Even this last subject might be handled so as to be not unprofitable to specialists, but Mr. Boyd has rendered his pages unreadable by attempting to mention all the amendments and proposed amendments to bills, the attitude towards these bills and amendments of various members of Parliament and other persons, and the language employed by many of them in explaining this attitude. It is conceivable that such a treatise may find readers in England, but they will be few in this country.

The two elaborate volumes of 'Electrical Papers' by Oliver Heaviside (Macmillan) are made up of a series of papers the first of which was published in 1872, the last in 1891. The treatment of the kindred subjects of electricity and magnetism is almost purely mathematical, and illustrates in a very striking manner the extent to which electricity has now become a branch of mathematical physics. Few persons will find the work easy reading, yet it is much less difficult than might at first appear, and well deserves attentive study. In the long preface the author takes the public into his confidence in a conversational sort of way, making excuses and assigning reasons for the collection of his very numerous papers. The work is frequently interrupted by remarks which put author and reader upon good terms with each other, and which sometimes excite a smile, as when, for instance, a formula resulting from a long train of mathematical reasoning is pronounced "ridiculously simple." The author's hearty interest in his work, his frank criticisms of the methods of others—his summary rejection of quaternions, for example—and his general independence and good-humored self-assertion, are very attractive. The book cannot fail to be useful, and to find a limited but appreciative circle of readers and students.

Prof. Andrew Gray's two new volumes, 'Absolute Measurements in Electricity and Magnetism' (Macmillan), form Parts i. and ii. of the second volume of his well-known work, probably the most complete which has been published upon the subjects treated. Part i. is devoted chiefly to the mathematical theories of electro-magnetism and magnetism as a groundwork for thorough treatment of instrumental methods; Part ii. mainly to these methods in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very full detail. In fact, we know of no work which so thoroughly covers the whole ground. Though not too difficult for a well-trained electrical engineer, it will require serious study, and will well repay the effort to master it.

In his last published report for the year ending December, 1891, the President of Yale University commends contributions to the Alumni University Fund. Started the year previous, this fund amounted to $15,738 (the contributions in 1891 being $6,500), and the way in which it was raised suggests to the alumni of all our institutions of higher education undeveloped possibilities of helpfulness. Men and women of modest means and limited incomes feel some hesitation in offering units, tens, and hundreds where thousands and tens of thousands are called for, and are tempted to forget that, in the educational as in the business world, "the multiplication of small gifts realizes large sums, and the annual repetition of such gifts according to the ability of the giver must bring great help both to the permanent funds and to the income" of universities. It appears from this report that Yale's available funds were increased one-half within the previous five years (independent of buildings and improvements), and the list of her benefactions for 1891 discloses the fact that, of the 172 donors during that year, 148 had given sums under $1,000, 115 of them being amounts of $100 or under; nor does this list include those contributions entered *en bloc* under the heading "$22,071 for the New Gymnasium," and of $6,499 to the credit of the Alumni University Fund first mentioned.

The Secretary of Harvard University has just published a pamphlet supplementary to Prof. Palmer's discussion of students' expenses at that institution in 1887. In the main it consists of letters from the students themselves, giving in detail the experience of each one; but Mr. Bolles prefixes some general remarks which show that while the attendance at Harvard has greatly increased since 1887, the modes of cheapening the cost of living have also multiplied, so that the annual minimum has been lowered from $450 to $350, or even, as the writer of the most notable letter affirms, $300, "honorably and happily." Twenty-five members of the class of 1891 spent less than $500 a year.

A correspondent writes:

"Those who like to find analogies for modern tendencies of thought and habit in the histories of great epochs of the past, will look in vain through the columns of your interesting review of Bishop Copleston's 'Buddhism' for any allusion to the prominence of a feminine element among the early followers of Gotama. In London, however, at the February meeting of the Royal Asiatic Society, of whose Ceylon branch the Bishop of Colombo is President, attention was called to this important feature of Buddhism by the paper of the day (by Mrs. Bode), 'On Some Women Leaders of the Buddhist Order.' These women belonged to the order of Bhikkhunis, or Sisters, founded by Gotama. They are mentioned among the contemporary disciples of the Buddha in a collection of his discourses called the 'Anguttara Nikāya,' and it is in a Pāli commentary (the 'Manoratha-Pūranī') on this ancient work that the stories of their lives are to be found. In these stories, which are said to have a distinct charm and human interest apart from their religious intention, the commentator Buddhagosha, who is of the fourth century A.D., points out that a few of the Bhikkhunis became renowned not only for their virtue, but for their intellectual gifts as well. They lived a life of entire freedom, though of great simplicity and poverty. That women should have held an important position as teachers of the Buddhist doctrines is a fact of great interest in the history of the philosophy that numbers about 450,000,000 adherents; and may be counted as a point with which controversialists should be called on to reckon when next the moot question of the contribution of women to the serious thought of the world is brought up for discussion."

"W. G. B." writes from Washington and Lee University:

"In confirmation of 'J. E. G.'s' inference with regard to shelving books with their backs to the wall as late as the beginning of the seventeenth century, may be mentioned a copy of Virgil in the library here, printed in Frankfort in 1596, and bound about the same time, which has 'Virgilius' in ink on the upper front edges. A copy of Basil of 1551, bound in leather-covered boards, has 'ΒΑΣΙΛ' in the same position."

—The question as to the choice of books and the selection of the best of them, which was begun by Sir John Lubbock some years ago in 'The Pleasures of Life,' and which has been pursued since by other writers, lively or severe, has just been taken up afresh by the *Revue Bleue*. It proposes a new inquiry into the selection of a library, and asks its readers to send in answers to the question: Which are the twenty-five best books? This is an appeal to a very intelligent jury, and one which, from its wide extent and the diversity of its pursuits and studies and habits of thought, is probably as well fitted to its work as any that could be had. Whatever its finding shall be upon the complex question which is submitted to it, its verdict will be sure to be not only most interesting, but also curious and instructive. At the outset one thing at least is certain: there are great difficulties in the way of coming to any satisfactory conclusion. For whom is the ideal library to be chosen? For the specialist? For the man of scholarly tastes? For the "general reader"? For the average man? But who is the average man, and where is he to be found, and who knows his tastes? Possibly an approximation towards him might be got at if everybody would set down with absolute honesty and frankness his own individual opinion, and then let a balance be struck. Yet, somehow or other, this has seemed a hard thing to do. It is difficult to go through any of the lists of the "best books" that have hitherto appeared without feeling that many of the titles are put there not so much from a sincere personal liking for the books as from what may be called a sense of duty. This sense of duty was obviously, one might even say oppressively, present in some of the English lists—we do not say in Sir John Lubbock's. They were so intensely British that one could almost swear that he had been present at the making of them. "The best book? The Bible, of course! Put down 'Number one: The Bible, King James's version.' Number two? Why, Shakspere, naturally—yes, of course, Shakspere!" And so on through the list, of which the chief wonder was that ox-tail soup did not hold the third place in it. Another difficulty will be to hold the scales even between quantity and quality in judging a man's work, if, as the *Revue Bleue* permits, an author's entire works (in case his work has been homogeneous, as, for example, Shakspere's) may be sent in. There are a few authors *unius libri*, like La Rochefoucauld, or La Bruyère, every word of whom is valuable; others, like Voltaire, voluminous writers of books of greater or less value, but always of some value and sometimes of the very greatest; others, again, like the Abbé Prévost, authors of one masterpiece, and of fifty other volumes of utterly insipid trash. It is easy to foresee, under such conditions, how many hard questions will arise. But, however difficult these may prove, the excellent jury of the *Revue Bleue* will enter on its work with everybody's good wishes, and may count beforehand upon a very wide interest in its result.

—The immediate cause of the *Revue Bleue's* investigation is to be found in an *enquête* of the same sort which has just been brought to an end in Italy. This was conducted by Messrs. A. Guicciardi and F. di Sarlo, and its results have appeared in a little volume recently published at Bologna under the title of 'Fra i Libri.' The Italian investigation sought for five books only, and not a hundred, as Sir John Lubbock, or twenty-five, as the *Revue Bleue*. These five were to be chosen as if by a man going into intellectual exile, who was laying in mental food for a life-time. Two hundred and fourteen answers were received. The first ten books chosen, and the vote for them, were as follows: Dante, 109; Bible, 57; Shakspere, 54; Herbert Spencer's 'First Principles,' 36; 'I Promessi Sposi,' 36; Darwin's 'Origin of Species,' 28; Goethe's 'Faust,' 22; H. Spencer's 'System,' 22; Homer, 20; Leopardi, 19. This is a somewhat astonishing list, and one which provokes comment, a part of which we have already made. The preponderance of foreign authors is very curious. They are in proportion to the Italian authors as six to four, taking in the whole list; as seven to three, taking the first ten names. When the list of the *Revue Bleue* shall appear, there will be material provided for international comparisons that will be at the very least entertaining. For, besides the lists we have been speaking of, there is a German one, 'Die besten Bücher aller Zeiten und Litteraturen,' which was compiled at Berlin a year or two ago.

—Dr. Vogel's map of the German Empire is not yet finished, yet a supplementary work is already launched by the same house (Gotha: G. Perthes; New York: Westermann). A 'Deutscher Kolonial-Atlas,' compiled by Paul Langhans, is the new undertaking, and its scope includes a view of the spread of German emigration the world over, as well as those settlements peopled chiefly by Germans and governed by the mother country. There will be thirty large maps in all, with an extraordinary number (several hundred) of side maps, conveying graphically an immense amount of statistical information. For instance, in Part i., the first plate represents on a liberal scale this world-wide emigration of which we were just speaking; while below are three smaller terrestrial maps showing (1) the German missions to the heathen, (2) the colonial States of the world, (3) the routes of German emigration. Another plate shows the archipelago of the New Guinea protectorate. The quality of these maps needs no praise beyond the name of Perthes. The enterprise is more ambitious than that of an atlas, bearing the same title, just published complete by Dietrich Reimer, Berlin. This consists of five strongly backed folded maps, of which the first shows in one view the German colonial possessions, consular and diplomatic establishments, and steamship mail routes; the second represents Equatorial West Africa; the third, German Southwestern Africa; the fourth, Equatorial East Africa; and the fifth, Germany's Pacific Ocean domain. By a very convenient arrangement, the text, by Dr. Joseph Partsch of Breslau, is bound to the left-hand cover in such a way as to be readily consulted while the maps attached to the opposite cover are unfolded. Partsch's general disquisition on the German protectorate is attended by Richard Kiepert's exposition and enumeration of the materials for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

construction of each map, with an index. The whole forms an admirably thorough and trustworthy work of reference, and differs from Langhans's atlas not only in its strict limitation as already pointed out, but also in being intended for official use, whereas the other has a more popular character, and maps the entire globe. Both atlases may be owned and prized by the same person. So far as Africa is concerned, they show that Germany has a footing on the chief of the great lakes—Tchad, Nyassa, Tanganyika, and Victoria Nyanza. Here, as well as in Togo and in Southwestern Africa, she comes in close contact with British "influence," with the probability of no little friction and collision in trade and in authority.

—At a meeting of the Hellenic Society on February 20, Mr. A. H. Smith of the British Museum spoke on "Recent Additions to the Sculptures of the Parthenon," and gave the interesting intelligence that an appreciable addition to the fragments belonging in the south or right-hand angle of the west pediment has just been made. In November last the upper half of a male torso, identified by Michaelis as a Lapith in Metope XIV., was pronounced by Herr Karl Schwärzek, a Viennese sculptor, to be of too soft and round a modelling to make it a possible Lapith. Furthermore, it was worked completely in the round, while the metopes for the most part contain figures more or less engaged upon a background. Michaelis's identification was based upon Carrey's drawing, since the metope in question has otherwise disappeared, and his view falls to the ground now that the torso in question has been fitted into its right place in the west pediment. Trial with a plaster squeeze having been made, there was an unmistakable fit over an area of about four square inches, although the first sharpness of the surfaces had been somewhat worn away. Unfortunately, this happy addition does not diminish the difficulties which still beset all attempts to name the figures grouped in this angle. After a word or two on an unpublished reconsideration of this subject by Furtwängler, Mr. Arthur Smith examined a hitherto unpublished terracotta lamp representing the competition between Athena and Poseidon, and bearing upon the central group of the west pediment. Carrey's drawing would have both divinities facing the spectator, but, in view of this terracotta and the statuette of Athena from Epidaurus, already cited by Miss Harrison, it seems more probable that both appeared in profile. Recent additions to the metopes and the frieze are: (1) the head of a Lapith, undoubtedly to be assigned somewhere on the south side of the Parthenon; (2) the well-known and wonderfully preserved head of Iris and other fragments of the frieze found in 1888-9. In discussing the bestowal of these scattered bits, the comparative accuracy of Carrey's drawings on the one hand, and of Stuart's engraver on the other, was discussed, and the many sins of the latter were forcibly enumerated. Nearly every original drawing by Stuart has disappeared, only enough remaining to show how grossly his engraver has misrepresented him.

—Mr. Cecil Smith, also of the British Museum, followed at the same meeting with a paper on "Harpies and Sirens in Greek Art," his first contention being that "the Siren has in Greek art the form of a bird with human head or human bust and arms; while the Harpy has invariably the winged figure of a woman, with no other distinguishing feature, unless it be that in one instance her hands are drawn in a method suggestive of claws." Harpies and Sirens in later literature and on late monuments have been confused, Harpies being assimilated to Sirens; but the so-called Harpy-tomb is too early for its name, and must be called the Siren-tomb. Here Sirens are gentle messengers, bearing off the dead, as Sleep or Death often does. The Harpy was a personification of the great speed and havoc of storm-winds. Homer connects them with an inglorious death, Aeschylus describes the Furies as wingless Harpies. They, as harmful wind powers, are often pitted against the beneficent Boreads. Various points in the early myth connecting Boreads and Harpies with the tree of the Hesperides seem to localize the Harpies at Cyrene, where the north wind brings help and the south wind harm. The myth travelled northward and was refashioned by Hesiod. The speaker then argued that the Würzburg Phineus cup came not from Asia Minor but from a Greek colony in Africa, and proceeded to point out a new interpretation for a Greco-Egyptian vase painting recently published, where he finds Boreas as a good-wind spirit opposed to the baneful Harpy. The myth in which this opposition chiefly shaped itself was of African growth, the Phineus myth being of a more northerly origin. Certain winged figures in early Greek art were very hard to name: particularly often in Cyrenaic works there was doubt whether a given figure should be called Nike, Iris, Harpy, or Boread. The speaker then endeavored to solve this difficulty in several cases, and closed with the communication of two interesting discoveries which he had recently made of (1) a vase referring to the foundation of a sanctuary of Heracles Kynosarges by the Attic demi-hero Diomos, (2) a vase bearing the name of Acamas, an Attic tribe-hero dear to the potters because they were of the tribe Acamantis. Hitherto this name had been conjecturally read as Aeetes because Medea stands near by.

RECENT NOVELS.

Susy: A Story of the Plains. By Bret Harte. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

The Chosen Valley. By Mary Hallock Foote. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

The Great Shadow. By A. Conan Doyle. Harper & Bros.

From Dusk to Dawn. By Catherine P. Woods. D. Appleton & Co.

Cosmopolis. By Paul Bourget. New York: Tait, Sons & Co.

WITH the arrest of the Star of Empire at the western ocean limit of the Continent and the establishment of settlements along its illuminated way, the story of pioneer vicissitude and perilous adventure becomes historical. The buffalo long since retired from prominence, and the Indian has followed him into obscurity. The "forty-niner," with his thousand vices, his single shining virtue, and his violent vocabulary, has departed, and, departing, left behind sons and daughters of questionable taste in opinions and dress, and very heavily gilded. Instead of human nature in the rough, settling little difficulties peremptorily with the bowie knife or revolver, we have human nature in the vulgar, prolonging squabbles by litigation, and resorting to endless underhand devices for getting ahead. The change in descriptive fiction is as inevitable as that in actual life, and so perhaps is the consequent dulness. We must regret both when invited by one who has conferred immortality, humanly speaking, on the rough-and-ready, short-shrift period, to consider characters representative of the advanced stage, and social questions arising out of that advancement. Bret Harte's story, 'Susy,' is of the kind that makes us mourn for the days that are gone. It is useless and unfair to find fault with Mr. Harte for falling short of his best work. The material out of which that was born is no longer at his command; and if, in that which now presents itself, there is opportunity for just as good work, it will be done by one who comes fresh to his labor, seeing the new order untrammelled by memories of the old and by the methods suited to depict it.

In comparing 'The Chosen Valley,' by Mrs. Foote, with her 'Led-Horse Claim,' it will be seen that she, too, suffers from a lack of adjustment to changing conditions. She is less assured and rather more prolix in her presentation of character, and the action of the drama is frequently impeded by insignificant discourse, which suggests a doubt about what was to be done next. Nevertheless, the contrast is well made between Norrison, the American engineer, who didn't care how the canal was built so long as he made it pay, and Dunsmuir, the Scotchman, whom "it hurt more to botch the job than to see the whole scheme fall through." If the description at moments lacks force, it is, on the whole, impressive, and a severe arraignment by illustration of that dishonesty in money-getting which is not confined to the West, nor yet exclusively American. Along with the great project for irrigating the Chosen Valley runs a natural and graceful romance, whereby conflicting interests are united and strife is silenced by love. The tragedy of Dunsmuir's death neither disappoints nor shocks; it is only the summary extinction of a man whose inability to yield to strength opposing itself to his convictions, or to compromise with coercion, made life itself a prolonged tragedy of one sort or another.

On Mr. Conan Doyle, as an historical novelist, there appears to have fallen at least a shred of Sir Walter's mantle, and a little incident in 'The Great Shadow' suggests that Mr. Doyle has a proper, reverential regard for the master in his chosen art. Jack Calder, the narrator, tells how one night, when the beacon-lights flashed out on the Scotch border, filling the countryside with terror lest the French had really crossed, there rode past his gate, among others, a heavy man on a roan horse. He stopped to "speer the way," and, taking off his hat, showed a great high brow running back into tufts of sandy hair. When he had spurred on, an Edinburgh student, staying at the West Inch farm, said: "That's a lawyer in Edinburgh and a braw hand at the 'stringin' of verses. Wattie Scott is his name." When the name of the Corsican who for a generation cast a shadow over Europe, was a myth in Scotland, and that of the Edinburgh lawyer common property, the Calder family plumed itself on that chance word with Wattie Scott. Jack Calder tells admirably the tale of his family's connection with the terrible "Bony," ending with the final dissipation of the Great Shadow at Waterloo, where Jack himself plays an humble part. His manner is at once direct and leisurely, keeping the main issue well in view, yet not hesitating to digress incidentally. It is safe to assume that no passages in a novel are more consistently skipped than the descriptions of a battle, or, if read, so little understood. Mr. Doyle has the power to make such descriptions clear and thrilling, and any one who may skip his battle scenes, on general principles, will make a great mistake.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The young person who embroils the lowly in the affairs of the great is a very clever example of the eternal feminine in an aspect neither high nor holy. For a country lass to play fast and loose with two honest compatriots of her own station, and cheat both by marrying a Colonel of the Emperor's Guard, is doing pretty well—far too well to appear true if her conduct were not plainly the expression of an instinct, independent of education and prior to experience. There is no doubt about Edie Calder. Whatever such a damsel may undertake in the way of fascinating men and disarming the suspicion of women, she is sure to accomplish. She is a rare person, and precious as a specimen of original sin justified by original charm.

'From Dusk to Dawn' is a triumphant example of the modern religious novel evolved from the primitive tract through the innocuous Sunday-school book. It is calculated to drive to despair those not deeply read in the subtleties of ancient superstition and mysticism, nor eager to engraft them on modern life and thought. Each person in the book represents a phase of so-called religious thought, and, through much struggle and anguish, most arrive at "vitalism," which appears to satisfy them and to establish itself as the future Rock of Ages. It is difficult for the unlearned to perceive why and how "vitalism" is an improvement on Christianity, and, unless it should secure more lucid exposition, we fear that the majority will ever remain ignorant.

The English reviewer of a French novel experiences at the outset one sensation of joy, derived from a perfect irresponsibility about the morality or the immorality of the book before him. He says to his public: "Now, this is the way they do in France. If you know the way and don't like it, or if you don't know the way and don't want to, shun the book." To read M. Paul Bourget's 'Cosmopolis' with any pleasure or profit, the situation must be accepted with a freedom from moral fastidiousness similar to that of the author and of the society which he is representing. This society is a little group comprising several nationalities, and abiding temporarily in Rome. It is the very best society, so far as birth and wealth and the cultivation of the world can make the best. The author's serious motive is to prove the permanence of race; his hypothesis being that, in moments of passion, when a man's nature is deeply touched, racial traits will show. This is an agreeable hypothesis for most of us, allowing such wide latitude for individual iniquity. It is a pity that the author has insisted on it so strongly, because we are constrained constantly to remember his theory and to observe how accurately he is developing it. But there are many moments when his great creative skill relegates theory to oblivion, and these are the moments when, having reflected, we find that the theory has been most cleverly elucidated. The Venetian Countess Steno, and the English wife of Boleslas Gorka, are drawn with extraordinary force and finish. Nothing is to be desired for naturalness and completeness; yet impute to the one the race of the other, and we should be confronted by a caricature and a monstrous impossibility. In the drawing of Countess Steno, one is most impressed by the author's power of observation, and in that of Mme. Gorka by his insight. George Eliot sounded the souls of many of her countrywomen in crises of poignant grief and bitter disillusion, but she never excelled Bourget's representation of Mme. Gorka brought face to face with the proofs of her husband's infidelity. Two such characters give any novel literary distinction; and a half a dozen more, done with almost equal understanding, truth, and particularity, confer fame.

In form the novel falls below the highest standard of French art. The action alternately flags and gallops, and there is a quantity of padding in the way of very dry unimaginative description of the Eternal City. There is room for discussion about whether such a book should ever be rendered into English. Sentiment and impression are much affected by language, and, by the change from French to English, there is no doubt that sentiment is coarsened and impression indescribably altered for the worse. There is here no plea for translation in order to diffuse useful knowledge or to exhibit a fine style. People unacquainted with French suffer no hardship by the deprivation of such knowledge, and are, as usual, compelled to do without the style. It would be libellous even to compare the style of the English 'Cosmopolis' with that of the French. Nothing more clumsy and inadequate can well be imagined. And, in all Scotland, one could hardly find such prodigal misuse of the words *shall* and *will*.

MR. MORSE STEPHENS'S ALBUQUERQUE.

Albuquerque. By H. Morse Stephens. [Rulers of India.] Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1892. Pp. 222.

THIS is an interesting little volume on a subject which to many readers will be new. The British Empire in the East has so completely ousted its competitors and filled the scene as to make us forget that it once had rivals, Portuguese, French, and Dutch. Portugal was the first European Power, after Alexander, which founded an Eastern empire, and it was through Albuquerque that she founded it. Like Vasco da Gama, Albuquerque was a scion of a race of great navigators formed by Prince Henry of Portugal, himself named "the Navigator." A life more full of interest could hardly be conceived than that of Prince Henry in his castle on Cape Sines, instructing his mariners, sending them forth on his enterprises, and receiving their reports on their return. Nor can we ever cease to wonder at the miracles which the daring of these men and the other maritime adventurers of that age performed in their little barques and with their scanty appliances in the exploration of the unknown. Of the three ships with which Vasco da Gama made his eventful voyage round the Cape, not one, Mr. Morse Stephens tells us, was of more than a hundred and twenty tons burden, while the united crews numbered only a hundred and sixty men. The romance of that age can never return.

The primary object of the Portuguese in these enterprises was commercial. They sought to intercept for their own benefit the trade in the products of the East carried on through the hands of Mohammedans by Ormuz in the Persian Gulf or by the Red Sea. But, as in the case of the English East India Company, commerce in the East required the protection of fortified factories, and from this it was but a step to the acquisition of territory and foundation of an empire. Empire was the special policy and work of Albuquerque. The other commander, Almeda, opposed him in this, and advised the Portuguese Government to rest content with fortified factories. Sir Thomas Rowe, a leading statesman and diplomatist in his day, gave the same advice to the English. There are some who, not being fired with imperial ambition, and having misgivings as to the benefits of conquest either to the conqueror or to the conquered, are disposed to think, even at the present day, that Sir Thomas Rowe's advice may have deserved consideration. Albuquerque's designs were pretty far-reaching. Not only did he embrace in them Ormuz and Aden as well as Goa, but he hoped to make use of the Abyssinians for an attack on Egypt from the south, and for the overthrow of the Mohammedan dynasty reigning there. Failing this, he had a scheme for diverting the waters of the Nile and making them run through Abyssinia to the Red Sea, thus destroying the fertility of Egypt. He even requested his King to send him miners for the purpose. When so much that seemed like a dream had been actually achieved, ambitious fancy would naturally run riot.

Goa, of which Albuquerque possessed himself by extraordinary efforts of military skill and daring, was fixed on by him as the centre of his dominion. But he intended also to erect a fortress at Ormuz, the great emporium of Eastern trade, "the richest jewel in the world's ring." His feats of arms rivalled those of Cortez and Pizarro, or rather perhaps exceeded them, since the people against whom he fought were more civilized than the Mexicans and Peruvians and were provided with firearms and cannon. Unhappily, he also rivalled Cortez and Pizarro in cruelty. The Mohammedans against whom he had fought in Europe, who were the mortal enemies of Christendom, and whose trade it was his object to destroy, were the special victims of his ferocity. He butchered without mercy; he put to the sword the women and children as well as the men of a captured city; he perfidiously as well as savagely mutilated prisoners whose lives he had sworn to spare; he did not shrink even from assassination. This is the more shocking because he was not only not without culture, but a Latin scholar and distinguished for the elegance of his language. It is difficult to believe that any civilization which such a man could have imported would have been an improvement on that of the Mohammedan or the Hindu. On the other hand, the Oriental worships strength in a ruler, and is apt to identify it with justice and beneficence. We are told that the natives, after Albuquerque's death, when trampled on by other governors, used to go with offerings of flowers and oil for the lamp to his tomb, and invoke his protection. It was something, probably it was much, that, though unsparing of the blood of the natives, he did not despise them as an inferior race, but encouraged his followers to intermarry with them, hoping, apparently, to produce a mixed population, though it was not likely that his hope would be fulfilled.

It is easy to see why, among the four European empires in the East, that of England endured and that of Portugal did not. Portugal, as Mr. Morse Stephens says, was too small and weak to serve as a base; the drain upon her population and resources was too great. For a time she was annexed by Spain and her own enterprises were suspended. England, besides sailors innumerable, had a large landed gentry, the younger sons of which made excellent officers for her army, and a peasantry which made excellent soldiers. Moreover, the Portuguese, like the Spaniards, were religious persecutors, and they ultimately introduced at Goa the all-blighting Inquisition. The English were perfectly tolerant, and never meddled with the religion of the conquered. Such intolerance as they showed in their own country was, like

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their State Church itself, more political than religious—the result, when displayed against Roman Catholics, of the mortal struggle with the Catholic Powers; when displayed against Nonconformists, of the rebellion of the time of Charles I. Transferred to India, they were perfect Gallios, and that character they have always maintained. For a long time they discouraged and even excluded the missionaries; nor do they even now regard them with unmixed favor. Practices which offended them as rulers, such as suttee, female infanticide, and thuggee, they have put down; and they are now cautiously proceeding to the abolition of child marriage. But they have scrupulously abstained from interference with the faith or worship of Hindu, Mohammedan, Buddhist, or Sikh. That they ever furnished a guard of honor to Juggernaut is a fable; their soldiers were sent only to keep order among the frenzied crowd. They are too prudent to give scandal on either side; but they have respected all the religions, and legally recognized them all, so far as property or secular rights were concerned. The panic rumor among the Sepoys that the Government intended to violate their caste by making them bite the greased cartridges, was totally baseless, though the terrible effect which it produced revealed the mine which a spark of imprudence might spring.

Holland, like Portugal, was too small to serve as the basis of an Eastern empire, and too exclusively commercial in her ends. Nor had either of them force to guard the communication between the imperial country and the distant dependency. In the case of France, despotic corruption and misgovernment were as fatal to empire in the East as they were to colonization on our continent. In the murder of Lally the whole tale was told.

The day of Albuquerque was not the day of voluminous and graphic biography. Great things were then done, but not so much was written. In Albuquerque's case there appears, indeed, to be more material for the biography than there is with regard to the lives of most of his contemporaries. But it is not of a kind to produce much fulness of picturesque detail or much richness of coloring. If the book before us is consequently a little dry, this is no fault of the writer, who is rather to be commended for not filling in the details or heightening the colors by the exercise of his own imagination. The names of "Ormuz" and "Ind" to some extent set the imagination of the reader at work to fill in the picture for himself.

The portrait of Albuquerque is apparently from the life. It is that of a strong and sanguine man. The map of India which suits the history of Ranjit Singh well enough—though not too well—does not suit that of Albuquerque, to illustrate whose field of enterprise we want a map taking in the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and his starting-point on the east coast of Africa—Zanzibar. Even a place so important to the story as Calicut is not laid down. It is fair to say that the map professes only to "exhibit the principal places"; but where is the use of a map in an historical work at all if it does not illustrate the history?

Formation of the Union. 1750-1829. By Albert Bushnell Hart, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in Harvard University, etc. With five maps. Longmans, Green & Co. 1892. [Epochs of American History.]

In this compact little volume we have an abstract and brief chronicle of American history from the middle of the eighteenth century to the close of the Administration of John Quincy Adams. The same method is here followed as that which determined the form and content of the earlier volume of the series on 'The Colonies.' The salient and essential facts in our annals are seized with rare perspicacity, and are presented with a brevity and a terseness which never degenerate into obscurity. The narrative is crowded with facts, condensed into the shortest possible form of statement, and yet it has a literary concinnity which makes it as readable for its internal harmony as it is varied and copious in the details which float on its surface. Most compends of this kind, even when they contain solid matter of history, are likely to be tedious in proportion to their comprehensiveness—much as condensed milk, though concocted from the purest products of the vaccine udder, is liable, even when pronounced most "nutritious," to be little appetizing to the fastidious palate. Literary pemmican, however deftly it may be sliced and dried, or however carefully it may be conserved, is apt to pall on the taste of the cursory reader, useful as it may be to the systematic and methodical explorer who wishes to take a sustained survey over a wide tract of time.

Prof. Hart escapes from his dilemma and relieves his readers from tedium by skilfully discerning the lines along which such a work as this should be projected. Such an epitome, he truly says, "must be a study of causes rather than of events." Events must be so selected and so collocated as to reveal the causal nexus without much formal disquisition. The causal nexus must indeed be implicit in the very form of the statement, without needing the relief of historical didactics, and without being left to inference after the allusive manner of Gibbon, who almost seems at times to presuppose a knowledge of his facts as the basis of his commentations. A terse and logical form of historical composition need never fail in point of literary interest. Cicero tells us in one of his letters that, for his part, he always found himself "more interested in the causes of events than in the events themselves." The statement surprises us at first, as coming from a master of forensic rhetoric, until, on examining the illustrations which he gives, we find it was rather a literary than a philosophical curiosity which gave its zest to such an inquiry as he contemplated.

It is not easy, says Macaulay, to make a simile go on all fours, while no human ingenuity, he thinks, "could produce such a centipede as a long allegory in which the correspondence between the outward sign and the thing signified should be exactly preserved." It would be too much to expect at all points a perfect "correspondence" between causes and events, between statements and facts, in a work so centipedal as that which, like Prof. Hart's, moves with flying feet over our *summa fastigia rerum* for more than three-quarters of a century. We believe it is hardly adequate to say, with the author, that the English common law, as accepted by the American colonies, "was modified everywhere by statutes according to the need of each colony." Dr. Wharton has shown, as illustrating the instinctive and organic way in which a community insensibly throws off laws which have ceased to be declaratory of existing conditions, that some of the most important changes in American common law, during the colonial period, were effected rather by tacit assumption than by statutory enactment. The English colonies in this country when they went into colonial seclusion, had on them, says Dr. Wharton, "the garb of feudalism and chivalry; when they emerged from this seclusion that gorgeous but superannuated attire was dropped, and they reappeared in the sober simplicity suited to a young civilization"—and all this as the result of evolutionary desuetude rather than of positive law.

It seems to us that Prof. Hart supports a good cause with a bad averment when, in arguing that the Constitution of the United States is not a mere "compact," he says that the framers of the instrument could not have considered it in that light, seeing that, on the 30th of May, 1787, they voted in the Federal Convention that "no treaty or treaties among the whole or part of the States, as individual sovereignties, would be sufficient." Such a resolution, we know, was reported on that day, but we cannot discover that it was either discussed or passed.

It is certainly correct to say that "no irregularity" was found in Alexander Hamilton's administration of the Treasury, as the result of the Congressional inquiry of 1793, but we presume that, according to the stricter methods of our modern accounting at the Treasury Department, it would now be held irregular to advance moneys on the President's salary beyond the amount due at a given date. From a statement made by Mr. Hamilton in 1795, after he had retired from the administration of the Treasury, we understand that he sometimes did this to accommodate the President. Such "advances" were held to be justified by the circumstances of the case, inasmuch as Washington had refused to accept any stated salary beyond the expenses of his household.

It is not correct to say that the "Resolutions of '98," as passed by the Legislature of Virginia, declared the Alien and Sedition Acts to be "unconstitutional, *void and no law.*" The words "and not law, but utterly null, void and of no force or effect" were formally struck out by the friends of the resolutions before their passage, on a representation made by their Federalist opponents that, if adopted, they might encourage the people to disobey the obnoxious laws before they were repealed. Prof. Hart is entirely right when he holds that "the constitutional doctrine in these Resolutions was secondary" to their temporary political purpose in the eyes of the Republican leaders of 1798. The whole manifesto moved much more in the domain of party tactics than in the sphere of constitutional hermeneutics. It was only at a later day that it was transfigured into a fetish for men to conjure with, or erected into a rock of offence for men to stumble over.

The volume is remarkably free from misprints. "Loudon," on pages 38 and 39, should be Loudoun. Trescot's little book on 'American Diplomatic History' during the Administrations of Washington and John Adams is cited with a superfluous *t* at the end of the author's name. "Lee of Virginia" seems a rather cloudy compellation for the particular member of the Lee gens (Richard Bland) who figures on pages 147 and 149 as a member of the first House of Representatives assembled under the Constitution.

An Agnostic's Apology, and Other Essays. By Leslie Stephen. London: Smith & Elder; New York: Putnams.

Mr. Stephen collects in this volume articles which have before seen the light in various periodicals, though their recasting and expansion here have left on them few marks of the particular occasions which called them out; while affinity of theme and a certain order and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

progress of thought make the whole go well within a single cover. No mind of his generation has penetrated more deeply than Mr. Stephen's into the questions relating to the limitations of knowledge, the nature of belief, the methods of science, the rationale of toleration and of the propagation of truth; and his discussion of them is an intellectual treat even to those who remain unconvinced by his reasoning. He is as far as possible from being one who "disbelieves heavily" (to adapt Renan's phrase), and many a deft touch—as, for example, where he speaks of allowing creeds "to expire by the method of explanation"—gives the added point of humor to his acuteness.

The long chapter on "Poisonous Opinions," which is really an essay on toleration, furnishes an excellent instance of his power to wind himself into a subject like a serpent, as Goldsmith said of Burke. Starting out with Mill's position in the essay on Liberty, he points out the need of correcting and expanding the doctrine of toleration therein laid down. He challenges Mill's concession that truth may be suppressed by persecution. First catch your truth. It is only a "happy thought" conception of scientific discovery which allows one to suppose that, if Newton, for example, could have been caught and "stamped out" when on the point of announcing his theory of gravitation, the truth would have died with its discoverer. Mill does not go far enough in claiming that truth has a "tendency" to triumph. It is bound to triumph unless the whole system of civilization of which it is an organic part is blotted out. Where can you draw the line? If gravitation is heretical, then you must not only condemn that doctrine, but all those studies in astronomy and navigation and physics which are so many finger-posts pointing to it. To stamp out a particular thought you must stamp out all thought. Mill's historical instance of the strangling of nascent Protestantism in Spain Mr. Stephen examines only to come to the conclusion that it was not Spanish persecution, but the entire constitution of the Spanish mind, which prevented the spread of Protestantism in the Peninsula. There is no good reason for supposing that the Protestant religion would have made any more headway in Spain in the sixteenth century, if not hindered by persecution, than it does in the nineteenth, when it is not hindered by persecution.

The entire chapter is marked by the highest qualities of thought and literary expression, and the volume as a whole is well worth the attention of those who would know what a singularly fair and frank and acute thinker has to say on the most important subjects of human thought.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Alger, Horatio, jr. Facing the World; or, The Haps and Mishaps of Harry Vane. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates.
Ball, Sir R. S. An Atlas of Astronomy. Appletons.
Brack, F. de. Cavalry Outpost Duties. John Wiley & Sons. $2.
Burdett, Henry C. Hospitals and Asylums of the World: Their Origin, History, Construction, Administration, Management and Legislation. 4 vols. and portfolio. London: J. & A. Churchill.
Crompton, Francis E. The Gentle Heritage. E. P. Dutton & Co. 75 cents.
Daniel, Charles. Al: A Social Vision. Philadelphia: Miller Publication Co. $1.
De Antiquis Marmoribus Blasii Caryophili Opusculum, cui accedunt dissertationes IV. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan.
Everett-Green, Evelyn. Old Miss Audrey. F. H. Revell Co. $1.50.
Romeo and Juliet. Illustrated. Duprat & Co.
Russell, H. R. Poor Lady Massey. London: T. Fisher Unwin; New York: Putnams. $1.
Ryland, F. Ethics: An Introductory Manual. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. 90 cents.
Sarcey, Francisque. Recollections of Middle Life. Scribners. $1.50.
Treanor, Rev. T. S. Heroes of the Goodwin Sands. F. H. Revell Co. $1.50.
Trenholm, W. L. The People's Money. Scribners. $1.50.
Trumbull, H. C. The Blood Covenant. 2d ed., with a supplement. Philadelphia: J. D. Wattles. $2.
Van Valzah, W. W. The Chronic Disorders of the Digestive Tube. J. H. Vail & Co.
Vogüé, E. M. de. Heures d'Histoire. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie.
Waterloo, Stanley. An Odd Situation. Chicago: Morrill, Higgins & Co. 50 cents.
Weismann, Prof. August. The Germ-Plasm: A Theory of Heredity. Scribners. $2.50.
Willink, Arthur. The World of the Unseen: An Essay on the Relation of Higher Space to Things Eternal. Macmillan. $1.25.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

McLaughlin's Literary Criticism.
Selections from Sir Philip Sidney to Pater, with Introduction and Notes. $1.25.

Pancoast's Representative English Literature.
About evenly divided between historical matter and *complete selections*. $2.00.

Ten Brink's English Literature.
Vol. I. to Wyclif, Vol. II, Wyclif, Chaucer, Earliest Drama, Renaissance. $2.00 a volume.

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell bills of exchange on and make Cable Transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies; also make collections and issue Commercial and Travellers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.
Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

HATCHARDS.
This is the favorite BOOKSTORE, and for 100 years the resort of the smartest people in London. It is visited and patronized by all who love books. London is the great market for books, and all the best as well as the cheapest editions can be had by writing to us. Special collections formed, and fuller information supplied than from any other house. Books both old and new, and relating to any subject, can readily be supplied at very moderate prices.
Agents for Clubs, Libraries, and all private Collectors.
187 PICCADILLY, LONDON W.

Bishop Phillips Brooks.
Imperial Panel Photos, on heavy bevel mounts, 14x17, for sale by
THE F. GUTEKUNST CO., 712 Arch St., Philada.

CATALOGUE 29, Americana, etc., just issued by E. W. NASH, 80 Nassau St., N. Y., and sent on application.

Dyspepsia

Dr. T. H. Andrews, Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, says of

Horsford's Acid Phosphate,

"A wonderful remedy, which gave me most gratifying results in the worst forms of dyspepsia."

It reaches various forms of Dyspepsia that no other Medicine seems to touch, assisting the weakened stomach, and making the process of digestion natural and easy.

Descriptive Pamphlet free on application to
Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I.

Beware of Substitutes and Imitations.
For sale by all druggists.

YALE MIXTURE
The choicest Smoking Tobacco experience can produce or that money can buy. MARBURG BROS.

SPECIAL BRAIN FOOD & NERVE TONIC.
CROSBY'S VITALIZED PHOSPHITES.
Composed of the Phosphoid Principle of the Ox Brain and Wheat Germ.
The very elements which produce vital force, increase brain power, sustain in vigor all the functions, prevent mental and nervous debility.
It is a *vital nutrient* phos*phite*, not a laboratory or acid phos*phate*. Formula on each label. Pamphlet with full information free on application to
56 West 25th Street, N. Y. *F. Crosby Co.*
For sale by leading druggists.

HOMŒOPATHY. If you know, or don't know, what you want, write to us—we can supply the goods or the information. Our DESCRIPTIVE BOOK CATALOGUE gives the fullest information of the books of Homœopathy; CONDENSED PRICE LIST gives prices of medicines, etc., and the HOMŒOPATHIC ENVOY (25 cents a year) gives reasons monthly why you should be a Homœopath.
BOERICKE & TAFEL,
Homœopathic Pharmacists and Publishers,
Established in 1835. 1011 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED